

-12



LIBRARY
OF THE
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
AT
PRINCETON, N. J.

DONATION OF
SAMUEL AGNEW,
OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Letter

81-1
7

May 22^d 1881

No.

Case, Division 500
Shelf, Section 1505
Book, No.





DEFENCE OF THE TRUTH,

AS SET FORTH IN THE

“HISTORY AND MYSTERY

OF

METHODIST EPISCOPACY,”

BEING A

REPLY TO JOHN EMORY'S

“DEFENCE OF OUR FATHERS.”

BY ALEXANDER M'CAINE.

Fear them not therefore ; for there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed : and hid, that shall not be known.—*Jesus Christ.*

I take it to be my duty, to be so faithful to the stock of reputation God hath given me, as to defend it at the rate of opening the TRUTH.—*Baxter.*



BALTIMORE :

PRINTED BY R. J. MATCHETT, 57, SOUTH STREET.

.....

1829.



PREFACE.

WHEN I commenced an investigation of the origin of Methodist episcopacy, I was a minister of the Methodist episcopal church. I conceived it, therefore, to be my *right*, and felt it to be my *duty*, to make the investigation. I commenced it in the fear of God, and as a candid inquirer after truth. I did it to obtain satisfaction upon points, respecting which, my mind had been, more or less, exercised for many years. I did it to ascertain the truth of the statement in the minutes of conference, that Mr. Wesley recommended the episcopal form of government: which statement, I could not reconcile with his letter to Mr. Asbury, in which, with unparalleled severity, he censured Mr. Asbury, for having assumed the title of bishop. I did it, to find out by what means the travelling preachers had become possessed of the legislative, judicial and executive power, when these same travelling preachers declared, that neither local preachers, nor laymen have any right to a representation in the general conference.

At the commencement of my undertaking, I determined to spare no pains to obtain all possible information, on the subject of my research. I resolved to avail myself of what had been written, respecting Methodist episcopacy, by its friends, or reputed enemies. I determined to weigh every argument as I went along, with all the impartiality I was able; and to judge of their value, not only by contemplating them in the abstract, but by taking them in connexion with the facts, upon which they were intended to have a bearing.

In forming the above determinations, I laid it down as a governing rule, to apply to no person, who might be suspected of being inimical to the institutions or prosperity of the church. When it was known that I was writing upon the subject, I was frequently urged to apply to certain individuals, who, it was thought, had an intimate knowledge of early Methodism: but as I was aware how the testimony of these individuals might be received, if it were obtained, I declined making any application. I thought it best to introduce no testimony, that might vitiate my book, but to rest my positions upon personal knowledge, the records of the church, such publications as I knew to be true, or such as had the approbation of the connexion, by being printed at the book room, and by being sold by the travelling preachers.

Upon points, concerning which I was at a loss, and which I deemed to be closely connected with the subject of my research, my first effort, to obtain the desired information, was, to address a circular to the five bishops of the church. In that letter I assured them, "that nothing disrespectful was intended in the matter or manner of my communication;" that I wrote with a view of being corrected, "if I had been led into an error by the documents in my possession;" and that I *felt* it to be a *duty* I owed to those in the episcopacy, to write to them "before I would commit the result of my investigation to the press."

There is, on the very face of my letter, evidence that it was dictated by a friendly spirit; that I was influenced by a love of truth; and that I was fearful of publishing any thing, which might injuriously, though unintentionally, affect the episcopal office. Although, from these considerations, I had reason to expect an answer, yet not one of them ever *condescended* to notice my letter. As gentlemen, they were under obligations to answer it. It was respectfully written, and was entitled to a respectful consideration. Standing at the head of the connexion, and filling the episcopal office, they were under obligations to answer it; because it related to subjects of a general interest to the church, and information upon these subjects, was all I required. By their silence, however, they have subjected themselves to the imputation of being indifferent to the truth, and to the welfare of the connexion. Having affixed their signatures to the book of discipline, and by so doing, averred it to be a fact, that Mr. Wesley recommended the episcopal form of church government, they were personally, individually and officially, under the most sacred obligations to say, where that recommendation could be found; especially when it was called for by a minister of their own church; by one who was older in years and in the ministry, than a majority of themselves; by one who had been twice in the itinerancy, and had filled some of the most important and responsible offices in the church; and who requested the information in a polite and respectful manner. Their silence subjects them to the charge of having affixed their signatures to a statement, of the truth of which, they were ignorant, at the time they did it; or now, when the recommendation is called for, and they cannot produce it, of endeavouring to impose upon the connexion by keeping up a show of things, deceptive and false. In whatever point of light, therefore, the silence of the five bishops may be considered, it will not redound to their credit; especially when I inform the reader, that of all those to whom I have applied for information, whether in the church, or out of the church, from the day I

commenced my investigation, down to the present time, they are the only persons, who have withheld an answer, or who have treated my application with *contemptuous silence*.

From the six old preachers, to whom the other circular in the "Appendix" was sent, I received prompt and polite answers. As gentlemen they knew too well what was due to a respectful application, not to answer my letter. And having no interests to serve, but those which were founded in truth and justice, there was no inducement to withhold a reply. Being confirmed by their answers, and by the *silence of the bishops*, in the conviction of the truth of the results, to which I had been conducted, by collating the documents, which I had examined; and being solicited by many of my friends, I, at length, determined to put my pamphlet to the press. In doing this, I had no wish that a replication should not be made. The contrary was the case; for as *truth* was my sole object, I had nothing to fear from a development of the truth: inasmuch, as whether my views were confirmed, or proved to be erroneous, I was sure to be a gainer. I did, therefore, wish for a reply, that if I were mistaken, I might know wherein I erred. I did wish for such a reply as would bear an official stamp, by being the production of some person or persons, appointed by an annual conference, or by the general conference. This was the course which I expected would have been taken; as an annual conference appointed a committee to prepare an answer to Mr. O'Kelly's pamphlet. See the preface to Mr. Snethen's reply. I did wish such a reply as would embody all the documentary proof that could be collected; that thereby the members of the church might be able to judge of the points at issue, and determine for themselves whether my views of Methodist episcopacy, and the episcopal form of her church government, were correct or erroneous.

Instead, therefore, of pursuing this fair, honourable and Christian course, a very different one was adopted. Dr. Thomas E. Bond, William Wilkins, Andrew Adgate, Christian Keener, and William Browne, drew up an "Address," which "was discussed and adopted by a large meeting of the male members of the Methodist episcopal church" in Baltimore, and ordered "to be sent to their brethren throughout the United States." In this "address" they express themselves in the following manner respecting me and my work; "a pamphlet written by a local preacher, in which the whole system of Methodism, is assailed with all the guile and artifice and sophistry of a Jesuit, and with all the malignity of which the human heart is capable. We allude to the History and Mystery of Methodist episcopacy, by Alexander M'Caine. A work which for malignity of purpose, shrewd cunning, misrepresentation of facts, and misstatement of circumstances, has no parallel among the productions of modern

times, on a similar subject, except the far-famed Cobbett's History of the Reformation."

As these gentlemen have represented me in this odious light, it remains for them to make their assertions good; otherwise, the infamy they intended to fix on me, will fall upon themselves. I call on them, therefore, nay, I *defy* them to prove what they have said: For, to say nothing of the other parts of their statement, they commence by saying that *which is not true*; namely that I have "assailed the *whole system of Methodism*." Nor, was the publication of this slanderous address the only means used to destroy my character. Private and scandalous reports were put in circulation. And this same Dr. Thomas E. Bond has since acknowledged to myself, that he said, "if he were to sweep the streets of Baltimore, he could not find a man under the influence of worse motives than I was." And although he has since denied it, the Rev. Mr. — will affirm that Dr. Bond said to him, "there was not a worse man in the cells of the penitentiary than M'Caine."*

In continuation of the plan to destroy my character, and thereby sink the credit of my book, charges of "slander and falsehood"† were preferred against me, for having, in a district con-

*That the reader may know what credit is due to Dr. Bond's statements, I subjoin the following letter of recommendation, which I obtained last year, when I was going to the South.

"BALTIMORE, NOVEMBER 8th, 1827.

"As the Rev. Alexander M'Caine has it in contemplation to spend the ensuing winter in the Southern States, with the view of improving his health; and as he has signified to us his intention to employ himself, while on the tour, in making arrangements for the sale of books, and in obtaining subscriptions for useful, literary and scientific works, &c &c.; we cheerfully avail ourselves of the occasion, to recommend him to the notice and confidence of such professional gentlemen and other citizens of taste and reading, as may feel desirous to be accommodated by his attentions."

JOHN B. DAVIDGE, M. D.	} Professors in the University of Maryland.
NATHANIEL POTTER, M. D.	

PETER CHATARD, M. D.

HORATIO G. JAMISON, M. D.	} Professors in the Washington Medical College, Baltimore.
JAMES H. MILLER, M. D.	
SAMUEL K. JENNINGS, M. D.	
SAMUEL ANNAN, M. D.	
JOHN W. VETHAKE, M. D.	

W. W. HANDY, M. D.

N. BRICE,	} Judges of Baltimore City Court
ALEX. NISBET,	

ELIAS GLENN, Judge of the U. S. District Court.

NATHL. WILLIAMS, U. S. District Attorney.

JOHN PURVIANCE, Counsellor at Law.

WM. WIRT, Attorney General of the U. S.

SAML. L. SOUTHARD, Secretary of the Navy.

JOHN McLEAN, Postmaster General

†The following are the specifications furnished on that occasion by Mr. Hanson.

"SPECIFICATION 1. In having at the district conference at Georgetown, D. C. in the year 1821, represented me as a dishonest man, and as having while in

ference, nearly *seven years* before, objected to a certain man's obtaining a license to preach. What hand Dr. Bond had in urging this man to prefer these charges, I will not say, though I believe he was at the bottom of it. One thing, however, is certain, that on the trial, the man of *copper spike* memory sent a person for his "friend Dr. Bond," and when the Doctor came in, his first effort, even before he sat down, was to have Alcæus B. Wolfe, Esq. my *stenographer*, turned out of the room. Failing in this, the Doctor then sat down beside the prosecutor, and appeared to be very busy in helping him to sustain the charges and carry on the prosecution. Will the reader believe, that although this man of *copper spike* memory was told by one of my witnesses on the trial, what I do not think it prudent to write, and was told it too, in the presence of James M. Hanson, Dr. Bond. the committee, and twenty or thirty witnesses, yet this same man, was in a Methodist pulpit the next day thereafter, and continues to have access to Methodist pulpits still; whilst Dr. S. K. Jennings and ten other local ministers have been expelled the church on account of their reforming principles!!

Finding that my pamphlet was working its way, notwithstanding the publication of the above address, signed "William Wilkins chairman," and "John Howland secretary;" and that the charges of "slander and falsehood" COULD NOT BE SUSTAINED, they next brought me to trial for writing the book. The same charges were preferred against me, which were preferred against the other brethren, who had been tried for being reformers, namely that I was a member of the Union Society, and patronised the Mutual Rights. To these was added, that I was the author of the "History and Mystery of Methodist episco-

the employment of Mr. Thomas Kemp. on Fell's Point, purchased copper, knowing it to be stolen; and of having left that place to avoid the penitentiary, or a legal prosecution.

SPECIFICATION 2. Of having in said conference made such allusion to, and representation of the circumstances which occurred at Fell's Point, as he knew to be untrue, and which made on the minds of the members of the conference, such an impression against me as a dishonest man, as induced them to reject my application for license to preach, notwithstanding I had the necessary recommendation from the quarterly meeting conference of which I was a member.

SPECIFICATION 3. That the said Alexander M'Caine, did on the 24th day of June last, or thereabouts, at Marcella Chapel, before the congregation then and there assembled for public worship, make allusion to some person who had been in the habit of holding public worship in that place and who had been at some former time compelled to fly from justice to avoid the penitentiary, (inuendo) meaning thereby me the subscriber, as will appear not only from his having made the same allegations in the district conference, but from his private communication made to Mr. Rezin Worthington, and to Mr. Nicholas Owings, as will appear by reference to certificates No. 5 and 7."

[A true copy,]

August 1, 1827.

J. M. HANSON.

pacy." How far the other charges may have contributed to my expulsion, I cannot say : but I believe the principal cause was, the writing of the pamphlet. To try the merits of this book, in the answering of which, I have reason to believe exertions were made to obtain the aid of Doctors of Divinity, Masters of Arts, preachers old and young, and even the bishops themselves, Nicholas Harden, Samuel Gore, and Edward Hall, three local preachers, were appointed a committee. These men are as capable of judging of the merits of the work, as they are of Newton's Principia. They know as much, perhaps, of Church History, as they do of algebra or conick sections. They were not, however, disqualified by their ignorance to answer Mr. Hanson's purpose, or the purpose of Mr. Hanson's masters, if he was directed to these measures by the bishops, or by any one of them.

It would seem, that the church authorities and the friends of Methodist episcopacy did not think it safe to rest their cause, upon the attacks made upon my character ; it was, therefore, thought necessary, that something should be done, which, under the semblance of argument, might have the appearance of confuting my book. To write it down, the Rev. John Emory, D. D. took up his mighty pen ; how far he has succeeded, an enlightened public will judge. Whether he was stimulated to the undertaking by personal animosity—by vanity—by a hope of aggrandizement—by the importunity of the friends of Methodist episcopacy—or by higher motives, one thing is certain : in preparing his "Defence, &c." he had every facility, and in obtaining for it a circulation and a character, he had every advantage he could possibly have desired.

He tells us in his preface, that he "asks not for charity, in the cold sense of that abused term" That all he "demands is simple justice—sheer justice." In conformity with his wishes, I shall endeavour to do him "sheer justice ;" and, as is my manner, I shall "use great plainness of speech." The circumstances under which I write, require that I should be plain.—They have left me no alternative. My work has been attacked by so many pens. My character has been assailed from so many quarters. So many base stratagems have been resorted to, with a view of injuring my reputation, weakening my influence, and destroying my temporal interests, that men, who know the value of character, will not, it is hoped, think I have transcended the bounds of Christian moderation, in exposing these proceedings. From men who can commend a work which I am compelled to believe was written to effect these purposes, I cannot, I do not anticipate any approbation. On the contrary, I know they will be exasperated in proportion as it is found that I am able to repel their attacks, and establish the views I have taken of Methodist episcopacy. I write not, therefore, for

them. I neither seek their applause, nor dread their arguments. I write in justification of my own character, and in defence of the truth, and shall leave to an impartial public to pronounce the verdict.

In reviewing Mr. E's book, I have followed the divisions of his work, and have even adopted the titles of his sections. It is respectfully suggested to the reader, that he read a section in the "Defence of our fathers" first, and then read the review of that section in my work. By this means he will be able to keep clear of all entanglement and confusion—judge of the merits of the respective works—and determine on which side lies the truth.

ALEXANDER M'CAINE.

Baltimore, December, 1828.



A DEFENCE, &c.

BEFORE I enter upon a review of Mr. Emory's book, I shall say a few words respecting its title. It may not be generally known, or remembered, that when the work was first announced, in the "Christian Advocate and Journal," it was announced under the name of the "Theory and History of Methodist episcopacy." Why was this title changed? Did the author think, that the work did not correspond with the title? And that the public would be induced to expect more from the title, than they would find realized in the book? Or, did he think that "Theory and History" was too cold and uninteresting a title, and that to call it "A Defence of our Fathers," was much more likely to promote its sale—awaken the sympathies of the members of the church, for "the fair and honourable fame of our fathers"—arouse their indignation against the man who undertook to examine the nature and origin of the episcopacy—and promote the views of the author, by fixing on *him*, the eyes of all, as being the man, who best deserved to be advanced to the episcopate? Be the reason what it may, the name of the work was changed, and it is now circulated through the country, by the travelling preachers and others, under the imposing title of "A Defence of our Fathers."

And who does the author mean by "our fathers"? It has been universally admitted, that Messrs. John and Charles Wesley were the founders of that religious denomination of people, called Methodists. To them the name was originally applied. Their names were appended to the general rules, by which the societies are governed. Mr. John Wesley claimed the title of "Father" for himself, and says, in a letter addressed to Mr. Asbury, dated London, September 20th, 1788, "You are the elder brother of the American Methodists. I am, under God, the *father* of the whole family." Although these were the fathers and founders of Methodism, yet neither of them has any share in Mr. E's "Defence." Of Mr. Charles Wesley nothing is said, only in an incidental way; and how Mr. John Wesley has been defended, will be seen hereafter.

As the "fathers" of the Methodists are passed over in silence, it is probable Mr. E. intended that Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury, the latter of whom Mr. Wesley calls the "elder brother," should be considered as "our fathers." I must be permitted, here to supply the omission of their names, as I do not find that the local preachers who first formed societies in America—

the travelling preachers who came over from England—the preachers who composed the conference of 1784—Mr. Whatcoat who was elected the first bishop, after the church had been organized—Mr. McKendree, now the senior bishop, or any of the gentlemen associated with him in the episcopacy, receive any notice, or partake in the slightest degree, of any advantage from Mr. E's "*masterly defence*."

But why does Mr. E. more than any other man out of one thousand five hundred travelling preachers, to say nothing of the numerous personal friends that Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury had, among local preachers and laymen, enter the lists in "defence of our fathers"? Was it in consequence of a vote of any of the annual conferences? Was it because there was no man competent to the undertaking but himself? Was it because he was so long, and so intimately acquainted with these gentlemen, whose "defence" as he calls it, he undertakes? Was it because his attachment to them was so strong, that any attack, real or imaginary, made on their "fair fame" would stir the blood within him to espouse their cause, and induce him to engage in a controversy, for which, from *disposition* and *habit*, he had such a settled and inveterate aversion? Nothing of all this." For, although Mr. E. writes as if he was the greatest, if not the only personal friend, that Dr. Coke or Mr. Asbury ever had; yet, I believe, he never saw Dr. Coke or received a line from his pen. And as for Mr. Asbury, if he had any acquaintance with him, it must have been very superficial. There was nothing that could be called an intimacy:—there was, perhaps, not even any correspondence. As there could be nothing, of a strong personal nature, to interest Mr. E. more than any other man, we must look for some other reason for writing the "Defence of our Fathers," than what grows out of personal esteem, and disinterested friendship.

He tells us, however, that the "fair and honourable fame of our fathers is a treasure committed to our common trust; in which all who bear their name ought to feel an interest; and to defend which is our common duty." This, to be sure, is very specious: but it will admit of some doubt, with those who are *intimately acquainted* with Mr. E. if, notwithstanding all he says about "duty," he would not have left the "duty" unperformed, if he had not thought, that the present occasion furnished a most happy opportunity, of indulging his vanity—gratifying his malignity—and promoting his views of ambition and aggrandizement.

At the general conference in 1824, Mr. E. had been put in nomination for a bishop. At that conference he received several votes for the office. His prospects of arriving at the episcopate, at some future, perhaps at no distant day, were as favorable as were those of his rival. The hope, therefore, of being raised to that elevated station, may have had a great influence

in inciting him to perform this "duty." And as the "History and Mystery" might gradually and effectually sap the foundations of Methodist episcopacy, if suffered to pass without an attack, it became necessary to make a show of defence, to prevent, if possible, such an event. Mr. E. knew also, that he would be obliged to relinquish the book agency, to which he had been appointed by the general conference; and in view of this relinquishment, a "Defence of our fathers" could be undertaken, which, under the appearance of vindicating the characters of the dead, might effectually promote the views and interests of the living. Besides, there is in the view of a proud man, so much honor in being a bishop;—there is in the view of an ambitious man, so much power and so many privileges connected with the office, that it is no wonder if Mr. E. was transported with the idea of being exalted to that station. To a man of his disposition, the very term is capable of producing such a train of pleasing ideas in the head, and so many delightful sensations in the heart, that to wish to be a bishop was too powerful a temptation to be resisted. Who can tell, what thrilling emotions he would feel, when he would hear, or read an appointment announced in these words; "Bishop Emory will preach in Light street church next Sunday morning at 10 o'clock." What ecstasy to see his likeness, executed by Longacre in his best style of engraving, put in the Magazine, placed in the windows of print shops, or hung up in the parlors of the wealthy Methodists, with this inscription, "John Emory, D. D. one of the bishops of the Methodist episcopal church."

In addition to the influence which the love of honor, and the love of power may have had, the love of money may also have had a share, in bringing forth the "Defence of our Fathers."—For when a bishop in the Methodist episcopal church is elected, he is elected a bishop for life. His support, and the support of his family, is no longer precarious or uncertain, depending on the stewards, or on the voluntary contributions of the members. It is from the book concern that he draws his support; and this support is commensurate with all his wants, of whatever nature, and to whatever extent, they may be. This is an object worth seeking. This is a "treasure" for which some would not be unwilling to write a "Defence;" a "treasure," which it is pretty plain, is more prized, than "the fair and honourable fame of our fathers."

To make his "Defence" popular, Mr. E. has taken great pains to make his readers believe, that I am the personal enemy of Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury; that I have written my "History and Mystery" "with all the malignity of which the human heart is capable;" and that with great "unkindness I pursue Mr. Asbury in his grave."* Def. p. 56. I must be allowed,

*Mr. Wesley had the same charge preferred against him. "His sacrile."

however to say, that there is not one word of truth in all this : so far from it, that I possessed the confidence and friendship of both these gentlemen as long as they lived. With Dr. Coke, it is true, I was not so intimate, as I was with Mr. Asbury ; owing to the Doctor's residing, principally, in Europe. Nevertheless, I corresponded with him, until he sailed for India. But with Mr. Asbury I was particularly intimate, and have good reason to believe, that there were few men, for whom he entertained a greater affection, than he did for me. It is therefore, a gratuitous assertion for Mr. E. to make, that I " have taken advantage of the lapse of time and the silence which death has imposed on the accused, to impute to them unheard of frauds and forgeries, which in their life time, no man living, had the effrontery even to insinuate." Def. p. 54. If, by this assertion, Mr. E. means, that I would not have published the views I now entertain, of the origin of Methodist episcopacy, if Dr. Coke or Mr. Asbury were alive, he must allow me to tell him, he is very much mistaken. Had I, before their death, the light on the subject, which I now have, I cannot conceive any reason why I should have been deterred from giving publicity to my views: but I had not. For, I never examined the subject until lately, always receiving as true, the statements published in the book of Discipline and Minutes of conference. If he means that I did not, or would not tell Mr. Asbury, at any time, what I thought to be wrong, he is again mistaken. On every subject, on which I expressed an opinion, I did it according to my apprehensions of *truth* ; sometimes of himself, sometimes of his administration, and sometimes of his colleague ; and never received a word of censure from him, for doing so. Indeed it never was my manner, or disposition to avail myself of the absence of men, to say of them what I believed it to be my duty to say. And if the reader will pardon the appearance of egotism, I will tell him, that since God was pleased to convert my soul, I have made it a rule not to say any thing of a man in his absence, that I would not say in his presence ;—that from that period to this, my heart has been free from the fear of man ;—and that I am not now conscious, of having flattered a man in all that time.—This is not the smooth way to heaven, but as far as I understand the principles and precepts of the New Testament, it is the way that is prescribed ; and this is the way I choose to walk in.

To shew the reader, that I am not the man, that Mr. E. would fain make his readers believe me to be, and to prove, that I possessed Mr. Asbury's confidence and friendship in a very high degree, I shall submit a few extracts from some of his letters.

gious hand violates the *ashes of the dead*, and traduces the character of Mr. Whitefield." " With *ungodly craft* he claws up the *ashes of the dead*."—Wesley's Works, vol. x. p. 484.

Norfolk, March 29th, 1799.

"My very dear Brother,

I had an impression upon my knees, that you would be the most acceptable person, to take a station in Norfolk in Virginia for the present year. My confidence in you as a man of *piety*, *conscience*, and *honor* is hereby signified &c.

Thy soul's real friend,

FRANCIS ASBURY."

Baltimore, July 16th, 1806.

"My dear Son,

If I loved thee less, I should not put myself to pain and scribbling. I love you, you know. I have always manifested it.—Your *honest bluntness* I approve &c.

As ever,

F. ASBURY."

In order that the reader may understand the import of the following request, it may be proper to inform him, that for several years, before Mr. Asbury's death, he had frequent conversations with me about undertaking the compilation of a work, to be extracted from the writings of the most pious and practical commentators on the Holy Scriptures. This work he frequently urged me to undertake; and in his peculiarly sententious, and emphatic manner of expressing himself, he used to call it a "focus." The following extract refers to this subject.

Philadelphia, April 30th, 1815.

"Dear M'Caine,

This following I write, highly momentous. The *focus* upon the great book. Have you begun? Keep your book always by you. Begin book after book; general history and contents: *mind, mind, mind*. I stir up your pure mind; make the best of every moment. A small introduction, of a few pages, will tell what stations the author hath filled. It hath been upon my mind for years; but who I should fix upon, it is *Alexander M'Caine*. I must as your bishop, father and brother bind it upon you.

As formerly and as ever thine,

FRANCIS ASBURY."

Shortly after the date of the above letter, and *not long before his death*, having heard that I had lost my companion, he wrote to me, pressing me to enter into the travelling connexion again, and to commence the work which he had so often urged me to begin,

Philadelphia, July 1st, 1815.

"My dear Son,

You cannot ride a district or circuit; you are past the meridian. Still we have work enough. Should you return to your mother's house, the chambers of her that bore you, perhaps you might be employed orderly and quarterly in Augusta, Sa-

yannah, Columbia, Charleston, Camden, Fayette, Georgetown, Wilmington, Newbern, Norfolk. You could not be too much confined. You are very positive about the key; but where materials can be had of the very best kind, *you* can do it, if you give up your time and mind, and only be called off to preach. Those leisure hours might be well spent for future generations. I have been reading these fifty years, and have never seen what meeteth my mind, I mean an universal *focus* taken from all authors worthy of notice.

Thine the same,

FRANCIS ASBURY."

I will not ask Mr. E. if he can produce any thing like the above. I am sure he cannot. These extracts, therefore refute the bitter, calumnious charges which he has scattered through his book; and furnish testimony from Mr. Asbury's own hand that he "loved me"—that I possessed his "confidence as a man of *piety, conscience* and *honor*"—that he "approved of my honest bluntness"—that he made choice of me for executing "a highly momentous" work—and that he was very solicitous to have me again in the travelling connexion.—How could he do all this, if he believed me to be such a man as Mr. E. has represented me to be. In Mr. E's efforts to blacken me, he spots Mr. Asbury; and wounds him, with the same weapon, with which he strikes at me. Such is the way that this champion wields his weapons in his "*unanswerable* and *masterly* defence of our fathers." There is only one way in which he can avoid this conclusion, which is, to prove that I have changed. This I challenge him to do. He would be glad if he could fix this imputation upon me. But the reader will allow me to tell him, I have not changed. I entertain the same love of *truth* that I always did. I have the same hatred for *falsehood* that I always had. I detest *low cunning* and *intrigue* as much as I ever did. And as for my "honest bluntness," which Mr. Asbury approved, but which some men hate, I think it is very likely it will go with me down to my grave.

Having said this much respecting the *title* of the book, and the motives of the author, it may not be amiss to make a passing remark on the *style* of the work, or the *manner* in which the "duty" has been performed. This is the more necessary, as I have heard it said, "the Defence of our Fathers" is a "*masterly* and *unanswerable* production." I was not surprised at this declaration, considering the quarter from which it came, and the persons, by whom it was made. For there are many, very many, who are ready to applaud what *they do not understand*. That Mr. E. as a writer, is deficient, in what critics consider the first and most essential quality of good writing, I mean *perspicuity*, no man, who has read his "Defence," and

who is capable of judging, will deny. Without stepping to account for this defect, I will say, if in any place, in the following review, I have misapprehended his meaning, it must be attributed to the obscurity of his style. This obscurity renders him, as he himself said of bishop White in his controversy with that gentleman, "hard to be understood, and of course, hard to be answered."



SECTION I.—On *Episcopacy*.

In my "History and Mystery," I inquire, page 9, "what views, do ecclesiastical writers give us, of an episcopal form of church government?" Which form of government, it is said in the minutes of conference, was "*recommended*" to the American Methodists by Mr. Wesley, and was adopted in consequence of his "*counsel*." In answer to this question, I collected and presented the views of different classes of ecclesiastical writers upon the subject. I did this, conceiving it would be proper, at the very outset, to ascertain the meaning of the phrase, "the episcopal form of government," that my readers might know the point of my inquiry, and understand, precisely, the subject of my investigation. The first of the writers from whom I quoted defines it thus; "*Episcopacy is that form of church government, in which diocesan bishops are established, as distinct from and superior to presbyters*" And all the authorities which I gave, although they differ upon other matters, agree in this cardinal point, that *bishops are a distinct order from presbyters and superior to them*. The reader is requested to bear in mind, that it constituted no part of my inquiry, whether episcopacy is of "divine appointment;" or whether bishops are a "distinct order" from presbyters, by "*divine right*," or "*apostolic succession*." My inquiry was, (1) whether bishops are a distinct order from presbyters? And (2) if bishops in the Methodist episcopal church, are a distinct order from presbyters and superior to them, by whose appointment were they made? These are the points to which my inquiry was directed, and to them, I confined myself, in my letter to the bishops. I asked them, "whether there is any paper to be found, in which, Mr. Wesley gave "*counsel*" to Dr. Coke, Mr. Asbury or any other person or persons, to ordain a *third order* of ministers in our church, meaning by that phrase, an order of bishops, distinct from and superior to presbyters? His. and Mys p. 74. The same question was proposed in my letter addressed to each of the six preachers, who were members of the general conference in 1784.

From this plain and simple statement, every one will perceive the matter of inquiry, and must acknowledge, that the question

is so free from all abstruseness, that in the judgement of common sense, there could have been no great difficulty in giving an answer. But to avoid coming fairly to the question, Mr. E. finds himself under a necessity, to entangle the subject, by introducing it in alliance with "*divine right*." This is unfair; and although it shews the ingenuity of the man, in forming this *holy alliance*, it will not escape the attention and censure of the intelligent and the pious. He says, "Mr. M'Caine represents the *common acceptation* of the term bishops to be an order of ministers distinct from presbyters by *divine appointment*, to whom the power of ordination is reserved, by the *same appointment*, and is the chief mark of their distinction; and in whom, as successors to the apostles, is vested the *exclusive right* of granting the *divine commission* to execute the ministerial office." Def. p. 20, Now this is a misrepresentation; for I say no such thing. I neither gave "*divine appointment &c.*" as my own sentiments, nor as the *common acceptation* of the term. I did not believe that these sentiments were the sentiments of even a majority of episcopalians. That I quoted them as the opinions of *some ecclesiastical writers*, I admit. So did Mr. E. when he gave the same opinions from Dr. Miller. Would it be fair in me to say, that Mr. E. and Dr. Miller represented the "*common acceptation*," of the term bishops, to be an order of ministers distinct from presbyters, by "*divine appointment*" &c., because some quotations from Dr. Miller, who gives the different views of ecclesiastical writers, respecting an episcopal form of church government, contain these sentiments? Surely not; especially, when not more than one out of twenty of the episcopalians, hold these sentiments. The fact is, I made no inquiry respecting bishops being a distinct order by "*divine appointment; divine right*," or "*apostolic succession*" Mr. E. knew very well that my questions had no reference to these things. I consider his statement as a specimen of his artifice to mislead his readers; but it is certainly too glaringly fallacious to escape detection, and too palpable to be imposed on men of sense.

Long before I wrote my "*History and Mystery*," I knew there were some writers, who use the words bishops and presbyters synonymously: that there were others, who make a distinction in the orders, representing the bishops to be superior to presbyters; yet this distinction and superiority, they represent as only of *human appointment*.* Whilst others consider bishops to be an order of ministers superior to presbyters, not by human appointment and expediency, but by "*divine ap-*

* "The form of ecclesiastical government established in England, was one of the first grievances of which the Puritans complained. This controversy was not carried on with animosity and zeal, as long as the English bishops pretended to derive their dignity from no other source than the

pointment"—"divine right," and "apostolic succession." I wished, therefore, to know, in what sense a bishop in the Methodist episcopal church is to be considered; whether as a distinct order from presbyters and superior to them; and if superior to them, by what appointment, "human," or "divine."

But, Mr. E. says, I ought to have known, "that there are ecclesiastical writers who describe *episcopacy* with *other features*." Def. p. 5. Here his language is equivocal. If by the phrase "other features," he means, that there are "other features" belonging to episcopacy, which I have omitted to give, his "other features" are to be superadded, to those which I have presented, to make the likeness complete. To supply this omission was his design, I suppose, in making his numerous extracts. But, notwithstanding he draws so largely on Dr. Miller and bishop Stillingfleet, will it not be somewhat of a curiosity to find, that although nine pages of his book are filled with extracts to prove, that "other features" ought to be added to what I have given; yet these "other features" are identically the same, with those which were given by me. Only let the reader attend to what I have extracted, and he will find this to be the case. My authorities represent episcopacy in the following points of light. 1. "Episcopacy is that form of church government, in which diocesan bishops are established, as distinct from, and superior to presbyters." Buck's Theo. Dic. Art. episcopacy. 2. "Episcopalians, in the strict sense of the word, are those, who maintain, that episcopacy is of apostolic institution; or that the church of Christ has ever been governed by three distinct orders, bishops, presbyters or priests, and deacons." R. Adams's Religious World, vol. 2. Art. Episcopalians. 3. "Bishops were ordained in all churches by the apostles, and derived from them, in a constant succession." Arch-bishop Potter p. 155. Again, "It is a principle universally established among episcopalians, that a succession from the apostles, in the order of bishops, as an order superior to and distinct from presbyters, is a requisite, without which a valid Christian ministry cannot be preserved; and that such bishops alone, possess the power of ordaining and commissioning ministers to feed the flock of Christ."

The reader is requested to notice, that here are three different views of episcopacy, all agreeing in one point, and yet differing in others. The point in which they all agree is this: that bishops are a distinct order from presbyters, and superior to them. This is the light in which all episcopalians, strictly speaking, consider this order of ministers; and this is what I

laws of their country, and pleaded a right purely human, to the rank they held in the church;" Wesley's Church History, Vol 3. p. 247. See, also, Buck's Theo. Dic. Art. Bishop.

consider the *common acceptation* of the term. But, as in Mr. E's quotations, so in mine, episcopalians differ among themselves, with respect to the *origin* of episcopacy, some considering it of "human institution;" and others, of "divine appointment."

But if, by the phrase "other features," Mr. E. means that the features of episcopacy which I gave, are not true and correct ones;—that I have drawn a caricature instead of a perfect likeness; and that I have misrepresented the subject altogether; then, I suppose, he means by an exhibition of *his* "other features," to correct my mistake, and set me, and my readers, right. But what, if Mr. E. should fail to accomplish this? What, if after all his vapouring, it shall be found, that *his* "other features" of episcopacy are the very same which I gave, only set out in a different dress? If this be the case, who is guilty of "*misrepresentation*"? He purports to give his readers "other features," differing from those which I gave, and then gives them precisely the same. The reader will now hear Mr. E. and then compare his statement and mine together.

"It ought to be understood, says Dr. Samuel Miller, that among those who espouse the episcopal side, there are *three classes*. The first consist of those who believe, that neither Christ nor his apostles laid down any particular form of ecclesiastical government, to which the church is bound to adhere in all ages. That every church is free, consistently with the divine will, to frame her constitution, agreeably to her own views, to the state of society, and the exigence of particular times.—These prefer the episcopal government, and some of them believe it was the primitive form; but they consider it as resting on the ground of *human expediency* alone, and not of *divine appointment*. This is well known to have been the opinion of arch-bishops Cranmer, Grindal and Whitgift, of bishop Leighton, of bishop Jewel, of Dr. Whittaker, of bishop Reynolds, of archbishop Tillotson, of bishop Burnet, of bishop Croft, of Dr. Stillingfleet, and of a long list of the most learned and pious divines of the church of England, from the reformation down to the present day." Def. p. 6.

Before I proceed to make farther extracts, I must be allowed to offer two remarks on this passage. *First*. I have asserted in the first volume of the "Mutual Rights," under the signature of "Nehemiah," that "neither Christ nor his apostles laid down any particular form of ecclesiastical government." *Second*. I never doubted nor denied "that every church is free, consistently with the divine will, to frame her constitution, agreeably to her own views, to the state of society, and the exigence of particular times." On these points, there is no difference between Mr. E's authorities and myself; nor are these the points at issue. The subject of inquiry is this; if the societies,

now constituting the Methodist episcopal church, in the exercise of their right to frame their constitution, preferred, at their organization, the *episcopal government*, in what light are the bishops of that church to be considered? As mere presbyters, or as an order of ministers distinct from and superior to presbyters? This is the inquiry under consideration, and Mr. E. knows it; and although he may wish to avoid it, he must be kept to this point. Now I say, that episcopalians in the strict sense of the word, maintain that bishops are distinct from and superior to presbyters. It remains for Mr. E. to prove, that the four arch-bishops, the five bishops, and the two doctors, whose names are found in the above paragraph, together with a long nameless "list of the most learned and pious divines of the church of England" held the *parity* of bishops and presbyters, otherwise I shall claim them all as witnesses in favor of my position.

"Another class of episcopalians go farther. They suppose that the government of the church by *bishops*, as a superior order to *presbyters*, was sanctioned by *apostolic example*, and that it is the duty of all churches to imitate this example. But while they consider episcopacy as necessary to the *perfection* of the church, they grant it is, by no means, necessary to her *existence*; and accordingly, *without hesitation*, acknowledge as true churches of Christ, many, in which the episcopal doctrine is rejected, and presbyterian principles made the basis of ecclesiastical government."

"A third class go much beyond either of the former. While they grant that God has left men at liberty to modify every other kind of government according to circumstances, they contend that one form of government of the church is unalterably fixed by *divine appointment*; that this form is episcopal; that it is absolutely *essential* to the existence of the church; that of course, wherever it is wanting, there is no church, no regular ministry, no valid ordinances." *ib.*

Now, wherein do those "other features" as Mr. E. calls them, differ from the features which I presented in my book? In no respect whatever. They are identically the same, as may be seen by the following parallelism.

"*History and Mystery.*"

"*Defence of our Fathers.*"

1. "Episcopacy is that form of government in which bishops are established as distinct from and superior to presbyters." p. 9.

1. "These prefer the episcopal government, and some of them believe that it was the primitive form; but they consider it as resting on the ground of human expediency alone, and not on divine appointment."

2. "Episcopalians in the strict sense of the word are those, who maintain, that episcopacy is of *apostolic institution*; or that the church of Christ has ever been governed by three distinct orders, bishops, presbyters or priests and deacons." *ib.*

3. "Bishops were ordained in all churches by the apostles, and derived from them in a constant succession." Again, "It is a principle universally established among episcopalians, that a succession from the apostles in the order of bishops, as an order superior to, and distinct from presbyters, is a requisite, without which, a valid Christian ministry cannot be preserved, and that such bishops alone, possess the power of ordaining and commissioning ministers to feed the flock of Christ." p. 10.

In a two-penny pamphlet, called an "Address" written by Dr. Thomas E. Bond, and signed by "William Wilkins chairman and John Howland secretary," it is said that I have "*misrepresented facts*" in my "History and Mystery;" but these gentlemen have taken good care to furnish no specifications, or offer any proof of their charge. I will ask them, and all others concerned in that address, if I have "*misrepresented*" the sentiments of ecclesiastical writers respecting episcopacy. If they know any thing of the subject, they know I have not. For all the writers, whom I have quoted, represent bishops as a distinct order from presbyters and superior to them. This is the *common acceptance* of the term bishops, and as such I gave it, when I expressed myself thus: "The *distinction* between bishops and presbyters being the *foundation* of episcopal government, and this *distinction* having no existence in fact, nor in Mr. Wesley's creed, our episcopal superstructure falls to the ground." But can I say that Mr. E. is guiltless of the charge of misrepresentation? I cannot. For he not only makes me say, that "the common acceptance of the term bishops is an order of ministers distinct from presbyters, by *divine appointment* &c." but he strives to make his readers believe, that I represent these as "the sentiments of Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury" Def. p. 7. With

2. "Another class of episcopalians suppose, that the government of the church by bishops as a *superior order* to presbyters was sanctioned by *apostolic example*, and that it is the duty of all churches to imitate this example." *ib.*

3. "A third class go much beyond either of the former. They contend that one form of government is unalterably fixed by divine appointment; that this form is episcopal; that it is absolutely essential to the existence of the church; that of course wherever it is wanting, there is no church, no regular ministry, no valid ordinances." *ib.*

adroitness he fastens upon the opinions of the third or last class of episcopalians, and represents these sentiments as mine.— With more truth and propriety might I attribute them to him: for I am arguing throughout my book against the imparity of bishops and presbyters. Whereas Mr. E. if he means any thing by his laboured production, must be understood as holding the opposite sentiment. The only reason he can assign for ascribing the sentiments of this third class to me is, that they are to be found as a *quotation* in my book. On this ground they are attributable to Mr. E. also; and not to him only, but in a qualified sense, to all who applaud and receive his book.

But why did Mr. E. select the sentiments of this class of episcopalians and give them as mine, in preference to the sentiments of the other two classes? It was not because they were the sentiments of the majority; for he tells us “that *nineteen twentieths*, of all the episcopalians in Great Britain and in the United States, hold no such opinions.” Perhaps he thought, if he could succeed in directing the attention of his readers to opinions so “extravagant” and offensive, he would be able to keep the imparity of bishops and presbyters out of sight. Excellent device!! To have given the sentiments of such an overwhelming majority, as the *common acception* of the term bishops, would, however, have been more fair. But alas! Mr. E. too well knew, that neither truth nor fair dealing could help his cause.

In sundry places in his work, Mr. E. censures me severely for not giving the name of an author, from whose work I made one of the foregoing extracts; and asks, “was it not because he was *ashamed* of it?” Mr. E. may not be better pleased with me now, for giving the name, than he was because I formerly omitted it. Be that as it may, I do not know that I have any greater reason to be ashamed of giving Dr. John Kewley as my author, than I would have, were I to have occasion, to give the name of Dr. John Emory.

1. Dr. John Kewley was born in Europe; received a liberal and classical education, being intended for a Roman Priest.

2. Dr. John Kewley declined entering into holy orders, studied medicine, and became a practitioner of physic, first in the West Indies, afterwards in the United States.

3. Dr. John Kewley joined the Methodist Episcopal

1. Dr. John Emory was born on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, received a classical education, being intended for the law.

2. Dr. John Emory studied law, was admitted to the bar, and became a practitioner on the Eastern Shore.

3. Dr. John Emory joined the Methodist episcopal

church, relinquished the practice of medicine, and after some time, was received as a preacher, into the travelling connexion.

4. Dr. John Kewley "deserted the Methodist episcopal church, and joined the Protestant Episcopal church; and after pronouncing upon that church, the most fulsome and high toned eulogies, subsequently abandoned it also, and went where all who hold such principles as he had avowed, to be consistent with themselves ought to go—to the Papists." Def. p. 33.

5. Dr. John Kewley professed to be converted under my ministry. He travelled round the circuit with me; I had, therefore, a good opportunity of conversing with him daily, and of noticing his deep piety and devotedness to God.

church, relinquished the practice of the law, and was received as a preacher into the travelling connexion.

4. Dr. John Emory was formerly announced as a *Reformer*, (see Dr. Jennings's third letter to Mr. Davaney "Mutual Rights," vol. I) which representation Mr. E. never contradicted. In conjunction with Waugh, Morgan and Griffith, he published a pamphlet against the tremendous power of the bishops*. But since he received a few votes to be a bishop, he has "deserted" the reformers, and become one of their most bitter opposers.

5. Dr. John Emory was stationed in Philadelphia, when I became acquainted with him. Being his colleague that year, I had an opportunity of conversing with him daily, and of hearing the sentiments of the people of his charge concerning him. And from the intimate knowledge I have had of the two men, I do not hesitate to say, that as a scholar, a Christian and a man of principle and honor, Dr. John Kewley is greatly to be preferred to Dr. John Emory.

* "A scrupulous and precise adherence to all the minutiae of the present mode of appointing presiding elders, is so far from being essential to Methodism that in its first and purest days, there were no presiding elders, and to this day, there are none in our sister connexion in Europe; and we believe it is a fact, that Mr. Asbury himself, when appointed by Mr. Wesley, a general superintendent, or a general presiding elder (for Mr. Wesley expressly maintained that *bishops* and *elders* are the same order) refused to serve in that office until he was elected by the free suffrages of his brethren in conference." See the above pamphlet, p. 2. "This claim of power we did then oppose; and we have ever since opposed it; and we hope we shall never cease to oppose it" p. 6. (But Mr. Emory and Mr. Waugh are now book agents, with comfortable livings and we hear of no farther opposition.) "We regard it as calculated to be acted upon, and to be built

SECTION II.—*Sentiments of Bishop White.*

For what purpose, are the sentiments of bishop White introduced? Is it to vindicate the validity of Methodist episcopacy? or, to demonstrate, that bishops, in the Methodist episcopal church, are truly and really an order of ministers, distinct from and superior to presbyters? That could not have been Mr E's object. They are introduced, ostensibly, to prove what I never denied, and what I thought, no man, possessed of common sense, having a proper regard for his own character, and for public opinion in these United States, would deny; namely, that every church has a right, not only to choose her own particular form of government, at the commencement of her existence; but to alter, change or amend it, after it has been adopted. Are these Mr E's sentiments? If they are, why did he express himself in opposition to them, in the answer to the memorial from "reformers" to the late general conference? If they are not, why attempt to pass off the sentiments of bishop White, who, according to the 34th Article of the church of England, allows the right of every church to alter and change things "ordained only by man's authority," as favouring Methodist episcopacy? This is another instance of Mr E's disingenuousness; and it was done for no other reason it would seem, but to blind the reader, by throwing a little more dust in his eyes; or to pave the way for episcopal *succession*. To shew that there is no relevancy in the sentiments of bishop White, to the subject under discussion, it will be proper to state the circumstances which elicited these sentiments from the rev. author.

"After the connexion, which had been formed between the spiritual authority in England, and the episcopal churches in America, had been dissolved by the revolution," Dr. White, now bishop White, published a pamphlet entitled "the case of the Episcopal churches in the United States considered." In this pamphlet he remarks, "all former jurisdiction over the churches being withdrawn, and the chain which held them together being broken, it would seem, that their future continuance can be provided for, only by voluntary associations for union and good government;" p. 7. It being "generally understood that the *succession*, supposed necessary, to constitute the *episcopal* character of these churches cannot be obtained at the present, the conduct meant to be recommended, is to include in the proposed frame of government, a general approbation of

upon for generations yet unborn," p. 7. "Remember the tenacious grasp with which power is held, when once acquired. Its march is onward, and its tremendous tendency is to accumulate." p. 12.

"Manners with fortunes; humours turn with climes;
Tenets with books, and *principles* with times."

episcopacy and a declaration of an intention to procure the *succession* as soon as conveniently may be; but in the mean time, to carry the plan into effect, without waiting for the succession." p. 15. From this extract, and from other parts in the pamphlet of a similar import, it may be fairly inferred, that the sentiments of bishop White are 1, "The succession is supposed necessary to constitute the *episcopal* character of the episcopal church." 2, "That the *succession* cannot at present, be obtained." 3, "That efforts should be made to procure the succession as soon as possible." 4, That in the mean time "voluntary associations for union and good government" be formed. And 5, that "any supposed imperfections of the intermediate ordinations might, if it were judged proper, be supplied, without acknowledging their nullity, by a *conditional ordination* resembling that of conditional baptism in the liturgy."

And are these the sentiments, on which so much reliance is placed to help on the cause of Methodist episcopacy? Are these the sentiments with which Mr. E. is so much delighted, that he declares, he "finds no small consolation from being in company so respectable"? They are consistent enough, to be sure, coming from the pen of an Episcopalian, who maintains the *imparity* of bishops and presbyters, and who holds the doctrine of "succession;" but for a Methodist preacher, who would be understood to reject these sentiments, to cry out, "*so say we*," is strange, passing strange, indeed. However, as the former ground on which Methodist episcopacy was made to rest, has been removed, and as Mr. E. has said the "march of power is onward" he may have intended, as was intimated above, that the introduction of these "sentiments" should serve as an entering wedge for the "succession" in the Methodist episcopal church; and that the "episcopal succession" being obtained, "any supposed imperfections of the intermediate ordinations, might, if it were judged proper, be supplied without acknowledging their nullity by a conditional ordination."

That Mr. E. may have had some squinting towards the "succession," as being introduced, at some future day, to subserve the interests of Methodist episcopacy, is probable: else why condemn the Protestant Episcopal church for the failure of the proposals, which had been made by Dr. Coke to bishop White? Hear what he says. "If this statement be correct, then the *responsibility* for the rendering of our deviation from *that line of episcopacy*, permanent, rests on them." Def. p. 22. Had there been no disposition, no desire, no "proposal" to go back to "*that line of episcopacy*" in which "the succession is supposed necessary to constitute the episcopal character," why blame the Protestant Episcopal church for the failure of the proposed union? But Mr. E. goes on. "The proposed union, by which our temporary deviation might have been cured, according to Dr.

White's plan of *conditional ordinations*, on the principle of conditional baptisms, was *rejected by them*." So then, "the temporary deviation might have been cured," Mr. E. being judge, had it not been that the proposals made by doctor Coke to bishop White failed. What now is to be done? How shall this evil be remedied? Very easily, if Mr. E's principles be adopted and his reasoning be acted on. He thinks it is not "*unlawful* to revive," what formerly, in the apostles' days, had an existence; that "admitting the lawfulness of our practice in this respect," (to revive what was formerly in existence) "the *expediency* and utility of it must be judged by those, whose concern it is," that is, the Methodist episcopal church. That "to make a thing *unlawful* which was before *lawful*, there ought to be some express prohibition of it; which in this case we suppose, with Stillingfleet, men will not easily produce from the word of God. As such an itinerant and extensive oversight, as *was* practiced by the *apostles*, and by Timothy and Titus, fell greatly into disuse, very shortly after their decease, it cannot be conclusively inferred, that it is unlawful to revive a similar superintendency in churches that may desire it." Def. p. 26.

That the Methodist episcopal church may "revive such a superintendency as was practised by the apostles and by Timothy and Titus," Mr. E. strives to get rid of one very formidable obstacle, which, he clearly saw, stood directly in his way: that is, the *character* of those church officers who were employed by Christ, in planting churches in the days of the apostles.—Mr. Wesley says "The *extraordinary* teachers, whom Christ employed to lay the foundation of his kingdom, were the twelve apostles, and the seventy disciples. To these the *evangelists* are to be added, by which title those were distinguished, whom the apostles sent to instruct the nations." Wesley's Church History, vol. I p. 55. Now let the reader attend to the method which Mr. E. takes to dispose of the difficulty growing out of the "*extraordinary*" character of those early "church officers," who "practised such a superintendency" as he wishes to "revive." He says 1. "That, in the apostles' times there were individuals travelling extensively as superintendents, bishops, inspectors, or overseers, in a larger sphere, and setting in order the things that were wanting in multitudes of churches, is undeniable." 2. "Whether such church officers were *extraordinary*, or not, as Stillingfleet says, we now dispute not." 3. "It is not *unlawful* to revive a *similar* superintendency in churches which may desire it." 4. "To make a thing *unlawful* which was before *lawful*, there ought to be some express prohibition* of it.

*Stillingfleet said, "the constitution of our church stands upon this *single point*, all things are lawful which are *not forbidden*." Allow this "single point," and "brother Peter" will ask no more. It will also serve the pur-

As there were "apostles and evangelists employed by Christ in planting churches," and the "superintendency" of these "church officers fell greatly into disuse;" and as there is no "*express prohibition*," making that "*unlawful which was before lawful*," it may be inferred, that it is Mr. E's wish "to revive such a superintendency as was practised by the apostles, and by Timothy and Titus." This being the case, when Mr. E. is bishop, there will be another *apostle* JOHN, and his presiding elders will be ranked with the *evangelists* Timothy and Titus. These apostles, though not of the old school, will be *divinely inspired*, as the itinerant preachers are now the "*divinely authorized*" expounders of God's word. They will have, also, the "gift of tongues," and be endued with power to work miracles. The "apostle JOHN" will then be able to say with propriety, when he is about to ordain a man, "receive the Holy Ghost;" and all this must be admitted, if it should be "judged expedient to revive it," by the Methodist episcopal church, "whose concern it is;" because there is "*no express prohibition*" to the contrary. Although these things may not be considered very *modest*, yet if Mr. E. can persuade the people not to "dispute" about them, or if he can induce the people to allow these pretensions, it may not be long before they will be asserted by the "*divinely authorized*" expounders of God's word, and the "*divinely authorized*" administrators "of moral discipline."



SECTION III.—*Mr. Wesley's opinion.*

"As to my own judgment, says Mr. Wesley, I still believe the episcopal form of church government to be scriptural and apostolical, I mean, well agreeing with the practice and writings of the apostles. But that it is *prescribed* in scripture, I do not believe." Def. p. 17. As Mr. Wesley's opinion is introduced by Mr. E. into his book, which was written expressly to vindicate "our Fathers," in relation to their having organized the Methodist episcopal church, and adopted the episcopal form of church government, it is submitted to the candid, whether common readers will not suppose, that Mr. Wesley expressed this

pose of the gamester, as well as the pope. There is no "*express prohibition*" says the gambler against billiards, backgammon, cards, dice or any of these games of play. No "*express prohibition*" against dances, theatres, races, or puppet shows, &c. One of Stillingfleet's opponents said, "the point on which his church stood would make a pure farcase of religion, it would justify the addition of oil, cream, spittle, and salt in baptism and it would as much authorize a minister to preach the gospel with a helmet on his head, and a sword and buckler in his hand as signs of our spiritual warfare as the cross in baptism. It is not enough in religion that things are not *forbidden*, they must be *commended*."

opinion with reference to this very subject. But, the following circumstances which gave rise to the expression of this opinion will show, that an occasion, very different from that with which Mr. E. has connected it, produced it.

Mr. Wesley published a sermon entitled a "Catholic Spirit," in which are to be found the following expressions. "I dare not presume to impose my mode of worship on any other. I ask not, therefore, of him with whom I would unite in love, are you of my church? of my congregation? Do you receive the same form of church government, and allow the same church officers with me? Let all these things stand by &c." Mr. Wesley informs us, that he "sent this sermon to Rev. Mr. Clarke with no particular view; but as a testimony of love to a fellow labourer." Wesley's Works, Am. Ed. vol. x p. 231. Mr. Clarke, with "openness and candor," wrote to Mr. Wesley, in which letter he gave "a very fair explication" of the text, to which, Mr. Wesley says, he had "no objection at all." After this, Mr. Wesley addressed a letter to Mr. Clarke, from which, Mr. E. extracted the above "opinion." It ought to be farther stated, that Mr. Wesley's letter to Mr. Clarke, which contains the above "opinion," is dated "Castlebar, July 3, 1756," twenty eight years *before* the organization of the Methodist episcopal church, upon which subject it is intended to have a bearing. This is another instance of Mr. E.'s disingenuousness.

It will not escape the attention, of the intelligent reader, that Mr. Wesley has given no definition of an "episcopal form of church government;" nor described those "church officers," whom he received. He merely refers to some opinion which he had expressed on a former occasion. Indeed the circumstances, under which he wrote, did not require him to be more explicit, inasmuch as he introduced those subjects incidentally. Had he been writing a "Defence" of episcopacy, or of an episcopal form of church government, "this great master of logic" would have settled the meaning of these phrases. He certainly would have told us, what he meant by "episcopacy"—what by "bishops"—what by an "episcopal form of church government." Has Mr. E. done this? He has not. It may, therefore, be inferred, that *he* is not a "great master of logic;" or that he has studiously avoided giving a definition of any of the subjects upon which he writes; knowing, that *definition* would be *destruction* to his cause. The reader will please keep in mind, that in all his book, Mr. E. has not *explicitly* stated what he means by "a Methodist bishop." That he leaves it undetermined, whether he meant to represent this church officer as a "third order," distinct from a presbyter; or whether he intended that a bishop and a presbyter should be considered as of the same order. When the reader meets the term "bishop," "episcopacy," or "an episcopal form of church government,"

in the "Defence of our Fathers," he will bear this circumstance in mind, and ask himself, does Mr. E. mean that a bishop in the Methodist episcopal church is a *third order* of ministers distinct from a *presbyter*? I do not add by "divine appointment," "divine right" or "apostolic succession," as he does; but simply, whether "our" bishops are a distinct order from and superior to presbyters? This is the point; and I shall insist, that Mr. E. ought to have confined himself to it.

In the foregoing extract, Mr. Wesley's judgment is given, with reference to some opinion which he had previously expressed. When did he express that opinion, and where is it to be found? Turning to his Notes on the New Testament, I find them dated "Bristol Hot Wells, January 4th, 1754." Between the date of these Notes and the date of the above letter to Mr. Clarke, there are just *eighteen months*. If we consult the Notes, they will enable us to comprehend, precisely, what Mr. Wesley meant, when he said, "I believe the episcopal form of government to be scriptural and apostolical." We shall then understand to what order those "church officers" belonged, whom he received; and we shall perceive at the first glance the irrelevancy of this quotation, and its inapplicability to Methodist episcopacy. Mr. Wesley expresses himself in the following manner in his Notes.

"The word bishops here includes all the presbyters at Philippi, as well as the ruling presbyters: the name *bishop* and *presbyter* or *elder* being promiscuously used in the first ages." Phil. 1 ch. 1 ver.

"A bishop, or pastor of a congregation." 1 Tim. iii ch. 2 v.

"Likewise the deacons must be serious. But where are the presbyters? Were this order essentially *distinct* from that of *bishops* could the apostle have past it over in silence?" 1 Tim. iii ch. 8 v.

"I read over Lord King's account of the primitive church. In spite of the vehement prejudices of my education, I was ready to believe that this is a fair and impartial draught. But if so, it would follow, that *bishops* and *presbyters* are essentially of one order; and that every Christian congregation was a church independent on all others." Wesley's Journal, January 20, 1746.

"Bishops and presbyters are the same order and consequently have the same right to ordain." See his letter of September 10, 1784.

"I firmly believe I am a scriptural *episcopos* as much as any man in England, or in Europe; for the *uninterrupted succession* I know to be a fable, which no man ever did, or can prove." Wesley's Works, Am. Ed. vol. x. p. 94. "When I said I consider myself a scriptural bishop, as much as any man in England or in Europe, I spoke on Lord King's supposition that bishops and presbyters are the same order."

No writer can express the parity of bishops and presbyters more clearly and unequivocally than Mr. Wesley did in the above extracts. No one was farther from advocating a third order of ministers, no matter by what name it is called; whether bishop or superintendent, than he was. And yet Mr. E. offers Mr. Wesley's opinion to support Methodist episcopacy, and her episcopal form of church government, although it is as clear as a sun-beam, that Mr. Wesley believed "bishops and presbyters are the *same order*;" and that the "episcopal form of government which he believed to be scriptural and apostolical, that is, well agreeing with the practice and writings of the apostles," was a government by presbyters, and an ordination by presbyters.



SECTION IV.—*Ordination.*

Mr. E. intimates pretty strongly, that I am a down right *simpleton*, for having brought a "silly witness" into court, and having put such answers into his mouth as would suit my purpose." Def. p. 37. Had I done this, I must have been a fool indeed; to rest my cause upon the testimony of such a "witness," when I knew, at the time I was framing those answers, that this "silly" creature would be liable to be cross examined by such a "profoundly learned" lawyer and doctor of divinity as Mr. E. "Silly," however, as this "witness" is, Mr. E. with all his pretensions to superior wisdom and learning, has past over these very questions and answers without a remark, thereby tacitly acknowledging, that they are too knotty for his mighty powers, or too self-evident to be confuted. To keep clear of such an imputation hereafter, Mr. E. shall be permitted to choose the witnesses, and put such answers into their mouths as he thinks will suit *his* purpose. The subject on which they shall be examined, stands as the title of this section, and all the answers, one only excepted, are taken from his own book, and from the book of discipline. Now, let Mr. E. through his witnesses answer for himself.

Q. What is ordination?

A. "Ordination is the solemn setting apart of a person to some public church office." Def. p. 19.

Q. Whence did Christians derive the "custom of ordination"?

A. "Their custom of ordination was evidently taken up, by the Christians from a correspondency to the synagogue." p. 18.

Q. In what manner, did the Jews, "under the synagogue," perform this ceremony?

A. "That under the synagogue was done by laying on of hands." *ib.*

Q. What use was there for performing this ceremony by the imposition of hands?

A. "A two fold use I find of this symbolical rite, beside the solemn designation of the person, on whom the hands are laid. The *first* is to denote the delivery of the person or *thing*, thus laid hands upon, for the right use and peculiar service of God. The *second* end of the laying on of hands, was the solemn invocation of the Divine presence and assistance, to be upon and with the person, upon whom the hands were laid." *ib*

Q. Did "the *bare imposition of hands* confer any power upon the person" upon whom they were laid?

A. No: "but with that ceremony, they joined those words whereby they did confer that authority upon them." *ib*.

Q. If imposition of hands conferred no authority, in what light was it considered?

A. "What is imposition of hands but prayer over a man." *ib*.

Q. If no authority was conferred by the imposition of hands, why was this rite practised?

A. "The practice our Saviour used in blessing children, healing the sick, and the apostles in conferring the gift of the Holy Ghost; and from thence it was conveyed into the practice of the primitive church, who used it in any more solemn invocation of the name of God in behalf of any particular persons." *ib*.

Q. Had the apostles any express command for laying their hands upon persons?

A. "We have no ground to think that the apostles had any peculiar command for laying on their hands upon persons in prayer over them, or ordination of them." p. 19.

Q. Why then did they do it?

A. "The setting apart some persons for the peculiar work of attendance upon the necessities of the churches by them planted, being enjoined, they took up and made use of a laudable custom, then in use upon such occasions." *ib*.

Will Mr. E. pronounce these witnesses "silly"? Will he object to the answers which they, together with himself, have given? I presume not. Then, let the testimony offered, by himself, be received and what follows? That the *imposition of hands* does not constitute ordination; does not impart any authority; does not create a new order; does not, in one word, make a bishop. These concessions and statements ought to be distinctly noticed, for it undeniably follows from the foregoing testimony, that Dr. Coke was not ordained a bishop by Mr. Wesley, nor did the bare imposition of his hands confer any authority.

Q. What was Dr. Coke's opinion, respecting the imposition of hands?

A. "I do not think the imposition of hands, on the one hand, as essentially *necessary* for any office in the church; nor do I,

on the other hand, think that the repetition of the imposition of hands for the *same office*, when important circumstances require it, is at all improper." Def. p. 90.

Q. As "the imposition of hands is not necessary for any office;" and as it imparts no authority, whence is "the *superiority* of our bishops" derived?

A. "The late Rev. John Dickins says, in relation to the superiority of our bishops, as derived, not from their separate ordination, but from the suffrages of the body of ministers. Pray when was it otherwise?" Def. p. 65. Again: "now who ever said the *superiority* of the bishops was by virtue of a *separate ordination*?" *ib.* And again: "we all know Mr. Asbury derived his official power from the conference." *ib.* And in another place, "Mr. Asbury was thus chosen by the conference both *before* and *after* he was ordained a bishop."*

From the testimony of Rev. John Dickins, it is plain, that "*separate ordination*" does not constitute a bishop. For the superiority of "our bishops," is derived, not from ordination, but from the suffrages of the body of ministers. It will follow, therefore, that Dr. Coke was no bishop; for he was not elected by the body of the ministers to that office. If he was one at all, he was one before he crossed the Atlantic. Mr. E. goes on: "The pamphlet containing the above sentiments, was published by the unanimous request of the conference held at Philadelphia, September 5, 1792; and may be, therefore, considered, as expressing the views, both of that conference and of bishop Asbury, in relation to the *true* and *original* character of Methodist episcopacy." Def p. 66.

As the Rev. John Dickins's sentiments are considered "the sentiments of the Philadelphia conference, and of bishop Asbury in 1792," and as these sentiments are said to afford a very correct view of "the *true* and *original* character of Methodist episcopacy."

Q. Which of these methods, "*separate ordination*," or "the suffrages of the body of ministers" is *now* used in constituting a Methodist bishop?

A. Neither, singly.

Q. How is a bishop constituted now?

A. "By the election of the general conference, and the laying on of the hands of three bishops, or at least of one bishop and two elders." Book of Dis. ch. I. sec. 4.

Q. "If by death, expulsion, or otherwise, there be no bishop remaining in our church what shall we do?"

* The superiority of Methodist bishops consisted of two elections; the one *before*, the other *after* he was made a bishop. Solomon, who said there is no new thing under the sun, did not live long enough to see this new sort of "*superiority*" of a Methodist bishop.

A. "The general conference shall elect a bishop; and the elders, or any three of them, who shall be appointed by the general conference for that purpose, shall ordain him according to our form of ordination."

Q. "What is our form of ordination?"

A. "After the gospel and the sermon are ended, the elected person shall be presented by two elders unto the bishop, saying, We present unto you this holy man to be ordained a bishop." After being interrogated upon several points, "the bishops and elders present, shall lay their hands upon the head of the elected person, kneeling before them upon his knees, the bishop saying,

Receive the HOLY GHOST for the office and work of a bishop in the church of God, now committed unto thee, by the imposition of *our hands* in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. *Amen.* And remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is given thee, by the *imposition of our hands*; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and soberness"

This quotation is of too important a character, to be passed over without being noticed: I shall therefore make two remarks on it. 1. It does not agree with Mr. E's testimony above, where it is asserted that "imposition of hands confers no authority, imparts no power;" because it is affirmed here, that the Holy Ghost is conveyed, by the *imposition of hands* for the office and work of a bishop. And the elected person is exhorted to "stir up the grace of God which is given him, by the *imposition of the hands*" of the ordainers. "Silly" as my witness was, he did not contradict himself; for it is a property of *truth* to be consistent. 2. There is not a man in the whole connexion, who believes, that it is in the power of the bishops to impart the Holy Ghost, the third person in the ever blessed Trinity, to the elected person, about to be ordained. Does the bishop himself believe, that it is his prerogative to do so, by the imposition of his hands? Do the elders, who are associated with him, in the performance of this rite, believe that they can do it? Does the person, who remains upon his knees believe, that he receives the Holy Ghost by the imposition of their hands upon his head? I will venture to affirm, without fear of contradiction; that neither the bishop who ordains, the elders who assist, the man upon his knees, nor the members who are eyewitnesses of the ceremony, believe that it is in the power of a poor, sinful worm of the earth, to impart the Holy Ghost, by the imposition of his hands. Why then, are the words ever used, when those who use them, do not believe the plain and obvious meaning? Why are they to be found in the book of discipline of the Methodist episcopal church? These words, with others of a similar import, may have been originally inserted in the ordination service *ad captandum vulgus*, and to favour the design of ambitious men; but in the mouths of Method-

ists, who, when they use them, do not believe one word of what they say, they are very improper.

Having presented the testimony of Mr. E. and his witnesses, on the subject of ordination, the reader is now prepared to estimate, as he ought, what is said respecting "both the good sense of those who framed it" (the answer to ques. 2. ch. 1. sec. 4. in the book of discipline) "and their acquaintance with ancient ecclesiastical usage." Respecting the good sense of those who framed that answer, I shall say nothing. But if Mr. E. says, that the manner of constituting a bishop, in the Methodist episcopal church, agrees with the form of constituting a bishop, in the primitive church, for the first three hundred years after Christ; or if he would be understood to say, that Methodist bishops are of the same rank, or are made in the same manner that bishops were then made, I must say Mr. E. himself knows nothing of ancient ecclesiastical usage.

That there is a great discrepancy in the testimony of Mr. E's witnesses, is very obvious. At one time, although the imposition of hands is "not necessary," yet certain words, which are used at the time of their imposition, convey "authority," and constitute the person upon whose head the hands are laid, a bishop. At another time, we are told, "the superiority of our bishops is not derived from their *separate ordination*, but from the suffrages of the body of ministers." And yet, in the face of this assertion, the Rev. Joshua Soule, who was elected a bishop in the general conference of 1820, "by the suffrages of the body of ministers," derived no "superiority" from his election; nor would he be allowed to exercise the office of a bishop without the "imposition of hands:" thereby making the imposition of hands "essentially necessary," the testimony of Dr. Coke, Rev. John Dickins, the conference held at Philadelphia Sep. 5. 1792, bishop Asbury, and I may add Mr. E. himself, to the contrary notwithstanding.

At another time, Mr. E. differs from the preceding witnesses, and from himself: for he affirms that "Dr. Coke's ordination (as a bishop) was performed as ordinations usually are—with the usual solemnities; by the imposition of hands and prayer with the assistance of other ordained ministers, and under the protection of Almighty God." Def. p. 24. Now, how does this account agree with the testimony in the former part of this section; wherein it is affirmed that imposition of hands imparts no authority? How does it agree with the sentiments of Rev. John Dickins; of the Philadelphia conference held Sep. 5. 1792; and of bishop Asbury, all of whom make "the suffrages of the body of ministers" the source of the superiority of our bishops? How does it agree with Mr. E's own sentiments, who says, respecting "the suffrage of the body of ministers," that it constitutes "the true and original character of Methodist episcopacy?" How

does it agree with ch. 1. sec. 4 of the book of discipline? Not at all. Nor does any one of these views, nor do all of them put together agree with the "ancient ecclesiastical usage" in constituting a bishop. For, in every instance, where a bishop was constituted in the primitive church, let the meaning of the term bishop, be what it may, he was always elected by the suffrage of the *people*, as well as by the "body of ministers." Yes, I say the *people* had a voice in the election of their bishop; and I defy Mr. E. to produce a single writer, on church history, who denies this to be the fact. The truth is, Methodist episcopacy has no precedent in "ancient ecclesiastical usage." It is a perfect anomaly. And from the above specimen of inconsistencies and contradictions, the writers in "defence" of Methodist episcopacy are at as great a loss to settle the form of ordination and define the term, as they are, to tell us what a Methodist bishop is.

Before I dismiss the subject of "ordination," I must make a few remarks upon a sentence, in the section under consideration, which, I think, is not a fair representation of the case of which it treats. It is this: "Great probability there is, that where churches were planted by presbyters, (as the Methodist episcopal church was) upon the increase of churches and presbyters, they did, from among themselves choose one to be as a bishop over them. For we no where read, in those early plantations of churches, that where there were presbyters already, they sent to other churches to desire episcopal ordination for them," Def. p. 19.

This purports to be a quotation from Stillingfleet, but where it is to be found in his works, I am not told. Nor, while I am noticing this omission, is this the only quotation which Mr. E. gives, without making the proper reference to the page &c. This is the more reprehensible in him, because he is so lavish of his abuse of me, for having once failed to give the name of an author from whom I made an extract. But allowing the fairness of the extract, the representation, which it makes, is not true. 1. It asserts that "the Methodist episcopal church was planted by presbyters." Not so; for long before this church was organized, the societies which constituted it, were "planted," not by presbyters, but by lay-preachers. 2. It intimates that there was no bishop until *after* the church had been organized, and that then, "upon an increase of churches and *presbyters*," those "presbyters did, from among themselves, choose one to be a bishop over them." This is not correct; for the creation of presbyters, the creation of bishops, and the organization of the church, all took place at the same conference. 3. It conveys the idea that the bishop was chosen by the *churches* and presbyters; or that the "*churches*" as well as the presbyters, had a voice in electing the bishop. Nor was this the case. The "*churches*," societies, congregations, or members had no voice in the organiza-

tion of the church, or in the election of the bishop. 4. It supposes that "there were presbyters already" in the Methodist episcopal church; and therefore, there was no necessity to send to other churches to have them ordained. Nor does this statement accord with matter of fact. For the societies sent to Mr. Wesley, requesting him to send them ordained ministers. 5. And after all, the whole proceeding, to which Stillingfleet alludes, is represented by him, only as a matter of "great probability;" and yet Mr. E. transfers it to the account of Methodist episcopacy



SECTION V.—*Ordination of Dr. Coke.*

I said in a former part of this work, that Mr. E. has misrepresented me, by making me say, that the *common acceptance* of the term bishop is "an order of ministers distinct from presbyters by *divine appointment*, and is the chief mark of their distinction; and in whom, as successors, of the apostles, is vested the *exclusive right* of granting the divine commission to execute the ministerial office." Def. p. 20. How he could have made this assertion is the more surprising; as in the paragraph immediately preceding this sentence, there are several quotations from my book, in which I distinctly state the *common acceptance* of the term bishop. "If Mr. Wesley ordained Dr. Coke a bishop in the *common acceptance* of that term, then he created a church officer *greater* than himself; and of consequence, he brought himself into *subjection* to Dr. Coke, by making the doctor his *superior*. Again, "If the doctor was constituted a bishop" (in the common acceptance of the term is here dropped, * says Mr. E. "he was raised to a rank *above a presbyter*, and invested with *superior powers*. In that case, he that was sent, was *greater* than he that sent him; and then Mr. Wesley, who was only a presbyter, and consequently *inferior to a bishop*, assumed the prerogative to send his *superior* to do a work in his name, which he himself could not go and do." And again, "If the doctor by the imposition of Mr. Wesley's hands is created a bishop, then the objection of the bishop of Norwich lies in full force; if a presbyter can ordain a bishop, then the *greater* is blessed of the less."

Now, in the name of common sense, is there any thing like *divine appointment* in any of these extracts? I merely stated

* What if it is? Will any scholar say it was necessary, or that it would be elegant to insert the phrase "common acceptance" again, after it had been inserted in the preceding sentence, which related to the same subject? He will not. Mr. E's censure proves, that he is ignorant of the rules of composition, or that he carps unnecessarily, with a design to mislead his readers.

the *common acceptation* of the term "bishop" to be a "rank above presbyters," "superior to presbyters," "greater than presbyters" &c. and this distinction will admit the addition of "*human expediency*" with more propriety, than it will "divine appointment." For Mr. E. to have added "divine appointment" to this distinction, when nothing was said upon which this addition could be founded, is utterly unjustifiable; and moreover, it would lead a person to believe that Mr. E. did not much regard what he said, so that he could only make his cause appear good. "All the smart sayings," therefore, which he has uttered here and elsewhere respecting "divine appointment," vanish into thin air; and, when he writes again, he must consider the *common acceptation* of the term bishop to be, an order of ministers "distinct from and superior to presbyters."

On page 23 of "His. and Mys." I expressed myself thus: "As Mr. Wesley and Dr. Coke were of the same order, to wit, the order of presbyters, the doctor had as good a clerical right to ordain Mr. Wesley a bishop, as Mr. Wesley had to ordain the doctor. This was the case according to Mr. Wesley's views of ecclesiastical usage, and this is the opinion of the Rev. Mr. Moore, Mr. Wesley's biographer." Upon which Mr. E. remarks, "As good a *clerical* right; Mr. McCaine seems to have felt, here, that his argument was lame." Def. p. 21. Lame! No indeed, I did not feel it was "lame;" and upon farther and closer examination, I find nothing like lameness in it. I find it strengthened and supported by Mr. Wesley's and Mr. Moore's authority; and the only fault Mr. E. can find with it, is, that it is but too well adapted to produce conviction, of the invalidity of Dr. Coke's ordination, as a bishop.

But let us examine it more closely. Whence had Mr. Wesley any right to ordain? From his being a clergyman of the church of England. According to Mr. Wesley's own account, "bishops and presbyters are the *same order*, and consequently have the *same right* to ordain." His *right* to ordain, grew out of his being a clergyman, and of course, was a "*clerical right*." And as Dr. Coke was a presbyter, as well as Mr. Wesley, the doctor had as good a clerical right to ordain Mr. Wesley a bishop, as Mr. Wesley had to ordain the doctor a bishop. It was not, however, upon his "abstract" clerical right to ordain, that I grounded Mr. Wesley's right to appoint Dr. Coke a superintendent over the American Methodists, but upon an acknowledged jurisdiction, then existing, in respect of Mr. Wesley. This is the very point upon which I insist, in the same paragraph from which Mr. E. made the above extract. This is the circumstance which justifies Mr. Wesley, and explains the whole of his proceedings. I say, "Mr. Wesley considered himself, under God, the father of all the Methodists in Europe and America. He considered that he had a *right to govern* those societies, which had been

raised by his instrumentality, and had put themselves "under his care." He considered it to be his prerogative, to transfer the power of governing the societies, which he could not personally superintend, to Dr. Coke or any other person, he might see fit to appoint." "His and Mys." p. 23. From these statements I argue, if Mr. Wesley had been in America, he could have personally superintended the Methodist societies, without being ordained a bishop: in like manner Dr. Coke being appointed a superintendent, could have governed those societies without being created a bishop. There was no necessity in the one case, that a third order of ministers should be created, any more than in the other. All that was necessary was, to transfer the *right of governing* to the delegated person; with a view to overcome the objections which might, possibly, be offered, if any attempt was made to govern them without Mr. Wesley's consent. This transfer of power, is called by Mr. Wesley, an investing of the doctor with "fuller powers;" and Dr. Coke, who is thereby appointed a superintendent, is made a bishop, by the friends of ecclesiastical power, contrary to Mr. Wesley's design.

I could not proceed with my observations upon the supposed ordination of Dr. Coke, without having first replied to Mr. E's misrepresentations and criticisms. I shall now take up that subject, and notice the circumstances which gave rise to it; and then treat of the different parts of it, in their consecutive order.

First. That which gave rise to it, was the distressed state of the societies. The Methodist societies in America, at the close of the revolutionary war, "were very much distressed for want of ministers to administer the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper, according to the usage of the church of England." There were preachers, who were in connexion with Mr. Wesley, but they were not ordained or authorised to administer the ordinances. "For hundreds of miles together," says Mr. Wesley, "there was none, either to baptize or to administer the Lord's supper." This is a brief account of the state of the societies; and upon it I shall make two remarks. 1. That it was the duty of those societies, in their then distressed state, to take all proper steps to obtain the administration of the ordinances. 2. That there was none, to whom they could apply for a supply, with more propriety, than they could to Mr. Wesley. His acknowledged piety and usefulness—his age and experience—and above all, the relation in which he stood to the Methodists, as the "father of the whole family," made it reasonable, that they should submit their case to him, ask his advice, and seek to be supplied through his agency. There was, besides, another reason, why he should be made acquainted with their state. "As early as 1778, a considerable number of the preachers earnestly importuned Mr. Asbury to take proper measures, that the people might enjoy the privileges of all other churches, and no longer

be deprived of the Christian sacraments. Mr. Asbury's attachment to the church of England, was at that time *exceedingly strong*: he, therefore, refused them any redress. On this, the majority of the preachers withdrew from him, and consequently from Mr. Wesley, and chose, out of themselves, three senior brethren, who ordained others by the imposition of their hands. The preachers, thus set apart, administered the sacraments to those they judged proper to receive them, in every place where they came. However, Mr. Asbury, by indefatigable labour and attention, and by all the address in his power, brought them back one after another, and by a vote of the conference, the ordination was declared invalid." Coke and More's life of Wesley. p. 350-1

Mr. E. has paid a very flattering compliment to the "good sense" of those preachers, who "framed the answer, to ques. 2. sec. 4. ch. 1. of the book of discipline." Whether any of those, who framed that answer, were of the number of those who declared the above ordination "invalid," I know not. If they were, notwithstanding all "their acquaintance with ancient ecclesiastical usage," they voted that this "ordination was invalid." Now, either their "acquaintance" &c. was not as extensive as Mr. E. would represent it; or some of his authorities are not entitled to all the credit, he would claim for them. For he tells us, after Stillingfleet, that in the reign of Edward VI. about the year 1547,* a very grave and *learned* assembly of *select divines*, was called by the king's special order, for debating the settlement of things according to the word of God, and the practice of the *primitive church*. It consisted of Cranmer, arch-bishop of Canterbury, the arch-bishop of York, and many other prelates and divines of the first distinction. To the questions propounded to the assembly, by order of the king, those eminent divines gave in their answers, severally on paper. The following are some of the questions and answers.

Q. 13. "Whether, (if it fortun'd a prince Christien lerned, to conquer certin domynyons of infidells, having none but the temporal lerned men with him,) it be defended by God's law, that he and they should preche and teche the word of God there or no, and also make and *constitute priests* or no?"

A. "It is not against God's law, but contrary, *they ought indeed so to do*, and there be historyes that witnesseth, that some Christien princes and *laymen* unconsecrate have done the same."

Q. 14. "Whether it be forfended by God's law, that if it so fortun'd that all the bishoppes and priests were dedde, and that the word of God shuld there unpreched, the sacrament of baptisme and others unministered, the king of that region shoulde make *bishoppes and priests* to supply the same or no?"

* Bishop Burnet, in his "History," says "Stillingfleet was mistaken as to the date."

A. "It is not forbidden by God's law." Def. p. 34-5.

Second. Of Mr. Wesley's right to ordain. As there seems to be no difference of opinion between Mr. E. and myself, on this topic, it will not be necessary to enlarge. That Mr. Wesley had a right to ordain, is unequivocally asserted in his letter of Sep. 10, 1784, amply supported by proof in the "History and Mystery," p. 61.—allowed in the "Defence of our Fathers' *passim*, and acknowledged by the Methodist episcopal church.

Third. The causes which induced Mr. Wesley, to exercise this right. 1. The distressed situation of the societies, mentioned above. 2. The persuasion and entreaty of Mr. Asbury and others. Mr. Wesley refers to these two topics, in his letter of Sep. 10, 1784. He says "In this peculiar situation some thousands of the inhabitants of these states desire my advice; and in *compliance with their desire*, I have drawn up a little sketch." Again, "For many years I have been *importuned* from time to time to exercise this right, by ordaining part of our travelling preachers." A similar account is given in "Drew's life of Dr. Coke." Eng. Ed. p. 62. And Mr. Moore in his life of Wesley, inserts a letter written by Dr. Coke to Mr. Wesley, in which he solicits Mr. Wesley to exercise his right of ordaining. "The more maturely I consider the subject, the more expedient it appears to me, that the power of ordaining others should be received by me from you, by the imposition of your hands. As the journey is long, and you cannot spare me often, and it is well to provide against *all events*, and an authority *formally received* from you, will (I am conscious of it) be fully *admitted by the people*; and my exercising the office of ordination,* without that formal authority, may be disputed, if there be any opposition on any other account; I could, therefore earnestly wish you would exercise that power, in this instance, which I have not the shadow of a doubt,† but God hath invested you with for the good of our connexion." Moore's life of Wesley. Vol. 2. p. 276.

The Rev. James Creighton, in a letter addressed to Mr. Samuel Bradburn, London printed 1793, says, "You take notice of a meeting which Mr. Wesley had, with some clergymen, at Leeds, in August 1784, at which he consulted them, concerning the ordination of preachers for America. Mr. Fletcher was present, and I believe Mr. Sellon, and two or three others. *They did not approve of the scheme*, because it seemed inconsis-

* "I am of our late venerable father Mr. Wesley's opinion, that the order of bishops and presbyters is *one* and the *same*: nor do I think that the repetition of the imposition of hands for the *same office*, when important circumstances require it, is at all improper." Dr. Coke.

† Mr. E. considers the words, "I have not the shadow of a doubt," to be of so much importance, as to be entitled to be put in capital letters. Def. p. 28. He remarks, also, at the bottom of that page "Yet in the face of this broad declaration, Mr. M'Caine repeatedly endeavours to make out, that Dr.

ent with Mr. Wesley's former professions respecting the church. Upon this the meeting was abruptly broken up, by Mr. Wesley's going out" p. 10.

Fourth. Of the persons who assisted Mr. Wesley. From the testimony of the Rev. Mr. Creighton it will be seen, that the Rev. Mr. Fletcher, Mr. Sellon and two or three other clergymen had been consulted, concerning the ordination of preachers for America; but they did not approve of the scheme. The only clergymen present at the ordination of Mr. Whatcoat and Mr. Vasey were the Rev. James Creighton and Dr. Coke. Whether Mr. Wesley ordained Mr. Whatcoat and Mr. Vasey deacons first, and immediately afterwards ordained them elders, I cannot tell. But Mr. Whatcoat and Mr. Vasey being ordained elders, immediately turned round, and with Mr. Creighton, assisted at the setting apart Dr. Coke a superintendent: and these three gentlemen (Coke, Whatcoat and Vasey,) are the "*three regularly ordained clergy*" as they are called in the book of discipline, who were sent over by Mr. Wesley *!!

Fifth. The time and place. Mr. Wesley says in his Journal. Wednesday, Sept. 1, 1784 "Being now clear in my own mind, I took a step which I had long weighed in my mind, and appointed Mr. Whatcoat and Mr. Vasey to go and serve the desolate sheep in America." And Dr. Coke's letter of appointment is dated Sep. 2, 1784. The place where the ceremony was performed was Bristol, and from an expression in Dr. Coke's letter, it may be inferred, that it was done in Mr. Wesley's private chamber. And yet Mr. E. says, "Dr. Coke's ordination was performed as ordinations *usually* are."

Sixth. To what rank or order was Dr. Coke raised; or with what authority or "powers" was he invested, by the imposition of Mr. Wesley's hands and prayer? It will, no doubt, be no-

Coke was doubtful of the validity of his own ordination." Yes; and I say so still; nor will this "broad declaration," notwithstanding it is put in capital letters, prove to the contrary. I would remark however, that Mr. E's language is ambiguous. Of what does Dr. Coke speak so confidently? Not of ordination. The subject to which he refers, and of which he says, he has "not the shadow of a doubt" is not his *own* episcopal ordination; although Mr. E. would make his readers believe it was; but the *power* which Mr. Wesley possessed as a presbyter of the church of England, to ordain ministers for America. The doctor had "not the shadow of a doubt," but Mr. Wesley was invested with *this power*. But surely he could not say, he had "not the shadow of a doubt" of his own ordination as a bishop, when at the time he penned these words, he had not even been set apart as a superintendent.

*I believe this is the only place, in all the writings of the Methodists, where Methodist preachers are called "clergy." Mr. Wesley never applied the term to any of his preachers, unless they were ministers of the Church of England. The writer of the first section in the book of discipline was not satisfied with Mr. Wesley's calling them "ordained ministers" but must improve them into "*three regularly ordained clergy*." A little paint will set off an ugly face, and give a freshness and bloom to a sickly countenance.

liced, that I do not use the phrase, "by his ordination;" for, notwithstanding Mr. E's cynical remarks, I contend, the imposition of hands was not an ordination, nor was it considered by Mr. Wesley in that point of light. In my "History and Mystery," I stated, that the letter, which Dr. Coke received from Mr. Wesley on that occasion, was "a letter of appointment, not of ordination." Upon which Mr. E. remarks, "on Mr. M'Caine's principles of verballity, this document should be called a letter of *set apart*, for these are the *words* used by Mr. Wesley. This is a specimen of M'Caine's logic in the management of documents." Def. p. 23. Perhaps I ought to thank Mr. E. for this compliment to my logical accuracy, though he may not thank me for exposing what is involved in his criticism. He censures me for adhering to what he calls the "principles of verballity;" clearly implying that he does not. Well, then, let him reject them. But, as words are only the representatives of ideas or things, I shall use the words that stand for those things; and shall call things by their proper names. Contemptuously as he may treat my "principles of verballity," he ought to know, that an infinitely more important thing than Methodist episcopacy, has been critically, and ably defended, by a "principle" of seemingly far less importance. Mr E. professes to be a Greek scholar; if he is, he cannot be ignorant of the force of the *greek* article. If he will look into Dr. Middleton on the Greek article, he will see how that article is used to prove the divinity of Jesus Christ. Or if he will read Dr. Clarke's remarks at the end of his Commentary on the epistle to the Ephesians, he will learn "that the principal design of these writers" (Mr. Grenville Sharp, Rev. Mr. Wordsworth, and Dr. Middleton) "was to exhibit a new and substantial mode of proving the divinity of our Lord and Saviour."

Was I not correct in calling this letter, a letter of appointment, not of ordination? I think I was. For, 1. If the imposition of hands had been considered by Mr. Wesley an *ordination*, no doubt he would have used that term in the written document. 2 He used the word "ordained," with reference to the other ministers, who assisted him in that ceremony, two of whom were Mr. Whatcoat and Mr. Vasey. "I have this day set apart as a superintendent, by the imposition of my hands and prayer, (being assisted by other *ordained* ministers) Thomas Coke, &c." Why this studied difference in the choice of words, if the transactions were of the same character? Why does he use the phrase "set apart as a superintendent," when speaking of Dr. Coke; and then use the term "ordained," when speaking of the ordination of Mr. Whatcoat and Mr. Vasey, if the one was an ordination as well as the other? 3. He makes no difference in their *order*, but expresses himself in the same language, when speaking of the work, which they were ap-

pointed to perform. In the minutes of conference for 1786, he says ; " I *appointed* three of our labourers to go and help them, by not only preaching the word of God, but likewise administering the Lord's supper and baptizing their children." 4. Mr. Wesley himself used the term "*appointed*" in the letter which Dr. Coke brought over with him, dated Bristol, Sep. 10th, 1784. " I have accordingly *appointed* Dr. Coke and Mr. Francis Asbury to be joint-superintendents &c." As Mr. Wesley did not *ordain* Mr. Asbury, but merely *appointed* him a superintendent ; neither did he *ordain* Dr. Coke a superintendent, but *appointed* him. Their names were coupled together in the same sentence, and both, alike, are said to be *appointed*. The authority with which they were invested was the same ; and the source whence that authority emanated, was the same also. 5 And even, Mr. E. notwithstanding his hypercritical remarks, forgets himself, or does not scruple to call it an "*appointment*," and an "*appointing*" when speaking of Dr. Coke's being commissioned to superintend the American societies.

Although I thought it necessary to put down this puerile criticism, it is of greater moment to ascertain, to what rank the doctor was raised, in virtue of his appointment to the office of a superintendent. The reader, no doubt, will bestow all his attention on this part of the subject ; because it is upon this point, the whole of the controversy turns ; and indeed, it may be truly said, upon it, the whole of the episcopal edifice rests. I shall therefore, in the first place, collect some of Mr. E's authorities, and present his views upon the subject, as far as I am able to ascertain them : and then " I, also, will shew my opinion."

Upon a cursory perusal of the " Defence of our Fathers," the reader might take up the idea, that Mr. E. had somewhere stated, what he meant by an episcopal form of church government, and what, by the term bishop ; for he talks about " our acceptance of the term." Def. p. 27. If he has any where defined the episcopal form of government, I have not been able to find it : nor to learn, by any thing which he has written, what is his acceptance of " a Methodist bishop." Some times he represents a bishop, as of the *same order* as a presbyter. Def. p. 10 and 34. At other times, he says, " In whatever sense distinct ordination constitutes *distinct orders*, in the same sense, Mr. Wesley certainly intended that we should have *three orders*."*

*The following anecdote will illustrate the manner by which Mr. E. makes three orders ' out of two ' A certain gentleman had a son whom he sent to a distant school. The boy, in stead of applying himself to his studies, spent his time in idleness. At the time of vacation, he returned to his father, who inquired of him how he had spent his time at school. The boy, with a great deal of smartness replied, I have been learning chop-logic, sir. Chop-logic ! said the old man in surprise, what is that ? Why father don't you know what chop-logic is ? No indeed my son, I do not. Well then, said the boy, I can explain it to you. At that moment, the servant happen-

Def. p. 88. In some places in his book, he attempts to draw a distinction between an "episcopacy in fact," and an episcopacy under the name of superintendency ; between the "title" of bishop and the "episcopal office." As if such a distinction is reconcilable with common honesty or common sense ; and by attributing these things to Mr. Wesley, he makes him out a fool or a knave.

I ask the reader, in the name of the God of truth, of him who "requireth truth in the inward parts," if he can believe, that the Rev. John Wesley, this holy and good man, who was without guile, and who was accustomed to speak with unparalleled perspicuity and precision, intended to impose the present form of episcopal government on the American Methodists ; and if his opposition and objection were merely to the "title" of bishop ? I ask him if he can believe, what Mr. E. has asserted of this aged minister of Christ ? If he can believe this of a man, who, for sixty five years, withstood undismayed, the united stratagems of men and fiends : a man whom some of the dignitaries of the church, and of the right honourable of the land, had vilified, called a fool, a knave, a fellow not fit to live ? Can he believe that such a man would appear before the world as recommending the episcopal form of government "in fact," but objecting in the strongest manner possible to the title of bishop ? Can he really believe this of a man who would say "I dispute not about words ?" I think it is not possible that any candid person can believe this of him, who could, *ex animo*, express himself in the following manner. "And is not truth as well as justice fallen in our streets ? For who speaketh the Truth as it is ? Who is there that makes a conscience of speaking the thing as it is ? Who scruples telling officious lies ? The varying from Truth in order to do good ?" And it is this man that Mr. E. represents as guilty of the most pitiful quibbling "about words." I would entreat all who would honour God ; promote his cause ; respect the truth ; recommend religion ; exemplify in their conduct the principles of the New Testament ; or venerate the name and memory of the Rev. John Wesley, to banish, from their minds forever, the unfounded and injurious distinctions on the above

ed to bring in a dish, upon which were two fowls. Father, said the boy, how many fowls are there upon that dish ? Two, my son. Now, father, I can demonstrate to you that there are *three*. The son, taking up a knife, and pointing to one of them, asked, how many is that father ? *One*, said the old man. Then placing his knife upon the other fowl, he asked the same question ; to which the father answered *two*. Now father, said the son, do not *one* and *two* make *three* ? I have, thus, *demonstrated* to you, by the rules of chop-logic, that there are *three* fowls upon that dish. However conclusive such an argument might be to the son, the father thought he could *demonstrate* the fallacy of it. Accordingly, taking up one fowl, he placed it on his wife's plate, as he said, for her dinner. The second fowl he would take for himself. And the third he would leave the son for his chop-logic.

topics, laid down in the "Defence of our Fathers." If such double dealing ; such prevarication ; such mental reservation ; such deception, would vitiate and nullify a policy of insurance, or any civil contract (and I am confident they would) how, in the name of Heaven, can they promote the cause of righteousness and truth ? Such doctrines may make deists, or confirm infidels in their opposition to the New Testament ; but they can never secure the approbation of the intelligent and pious, or obtain their esteem for the men who broach them.

I shall now "show my opinion," and in doing this, I shall first examine the account given by Mr. Wesley. He says, "I have this day set apart as a superintendent, &c." The first thing to be ascertained is, the meaning of the word superintendent. And what is a superintendent ? "A superintendent," says Dr. Johnson, "is one who overlooks others authoritatively." This is the plain meaning of the word, and in its common application, it is used to denote the person who oversees others with authority. Hence, we frequently read of superintendents of public works ; superintendents of roads ; superintendents of cotton factories and such like establishments ; superintendents of public schools ; superintendents of female charitable institutions, &c. &c. But, says one, Mr. Wesley used the word in an ecclesiastical sense by applying it to a church officer. And suppose he did, what other meaning did he, or could he convey by it, than what is given in the above definition ? It was because this was the very work for which he made choice of Dr. Coke, that he designated him by this title. There were several societies and preachers in America, when Mr. Wesley appointed Dr. Coke to superintend them. When he invested him with authority to overlook those societies and preachers ; and in his name, and as his delegate, to exercise the "powers" which he deputed to him. There was, therefore, no reason to suppose, that Mr. Wesley, by setting apart Dr. Coke as a superintendent, ordained him a bishop. There was not then, nor is there now, any just ground to depart from the common acceptation of the term. For whether we use it in reference to civil transactions, or ecclesiastical affairs, the meaning is the same : a superintendent being one who over-looks others authoritatively. This being the meaning of the term, it follows, that every presiding elder of a district is, from the very nature of his office and the work he is appointed to do, a superintendent. For, in the book of discipline, in answer to the second question in the section which treats of his office, it is stated to be his duty, "in the absence of the bishop, to take charge of all the elders and deacons, travelling and local preachers, and exhorters in his district." And what is all this, but overlooking others authoritatively ? Does he not do it by the *appointment* of the bishop ? Does he not do it in his name ? Is he not responsible to him alone ? And does he not overlook

those preachers with authority ? Now, although this is the duty of a presiding elder, no advocate for episcopacy ever said, that a presiding elder and a bishop, in the Methodist episcopal church, are one and the same in rank and authority. O ! no. Methodist bishops, although nothing more in the commencement than presiding elders or superintendents, as Mr. E. has observed above, will not let presiding elders encroach on their prerogatives ; yet they feel no repugnance to drop their original name, superintendents, and assume the more dignified and honorable one of bishops !!!

But was not Dr. Coke ordained a bishop, when Mr. Wesley set him apart as a superintendent ? Before I answer this question, I must understand what is the meaning of the word "bishop." Mr. E. has displayed what little smattering he has of the Hebrew, Greek and Latin, in giving us the etymology of the word ; and closes his short account, by telling us "that bishop is any man that hath charge and office for any business, *civil* or ecclesiastical." "And hence *superintendent*, from the Latin, is of precisely the same import as *bishop* from the Greek." Def. p. 66 That the words "bishop" and "superintendent" are both derived from the same root, I admit ; but that they are both "of *precisely the same import*," I deny. The term "superintendent" is used with reference to "*civil* business" only, or such subjects as have been enumerated above, and never applied by ecclesiastical writers, to a church officer, unless it be in an accommodated, restricted, or qualified sense. Whereas, the term "bishop" is never applied by ecclesiastical writers to "a man having charge of *civil* matters, but is universally used in an ecclesiastical sense, and applied to an officer of the church.

The difference between a superintendent and bishop, being fixed, the next thing to be considered is, to what rank, or *order* does a *bishop* belong ? Upon this subject, it is well known, that there is a difference of opinion among ecclesiastical writers. Some affirm that there are *three orders* of ministers, bishops, presbyters, and deacons. Whilst others contend that there are but two viz : presbyters and deacons. Those, who espouse this latter opinion say, that bishops and presbyters are convertible terms, and that they were originally used indifferently of persons in the same order. Whilst the other class insist that bishops are a distinct order from presbyters and superior to them. It would not be proper to swell this work, by examining this matter *pro* and *con*. The proper question to be considered is, what was Mr. Wesley's opinion upon the subject ? Because, if his opinion can be clearly ascertained, and fully established, it must be proved that he changed that opinion, or we, as Methodists, must admit it, whatever it be.

The question, is now, in what light did Mr. Wesley consider a bishop, at the time he "set apart" Dr. Coke as a superintendent? And to this question, the most clear and unequivocal answer can be given, in Mr. Wesley's own words. He says, in the very letter which he gave Dr. Coke to be circulated among the American societies, dated Bristol Sep. 10. 1784, eight days *after* the appointment of the doctor as a superintendent, "Lord King's account of the primitive church convinced me many years ago, that *bishops* and *presbyters* are the same order." Can any thing be more explicit than this statement? What opinion, then, must we form of Mr. Wesley if what Mr. E. says of him be true? Could he possibly, without being guilty of the greatest duplicity and falsehood, declare that there were but *two orders*, if he intended by setting Dr. Coke apart as a superintendent, that the American societies should have *three*? If Mr. E. cannot defend "our fathers" without fixing on them such a foul and indelible stain, he ought never undertake their defence again. *

As Mr. Wesley was convinced by "Lord King's account of the primitive church" that "bishops and presbyters are the *same order*;" it may be acceptable to the reader to present him with an extract or two from the work of this celebrated writer. "It is expressly said by the ancients, that there were but two distinct ecclesiastical orders, viz : bishops and deacons, or presbyters and deacons ; and if there were but these two, presbyters cannot be distinct from bishops, for then there would be three. Now, that there were but *two orders* viz: bishops and deacons, is plain." p. 68. Again he says, "There were only the two orders of bishops and deacons instituted by the apostles. And if they ordained but these two, I think no one had ever a commission to add a third, or split one into two, as must be done, if we separate the order of presbyters from the order of bishops." p. 69.

I said, above, that bishops and presbyters are convertible terms. Lest, however, my meaning should be misunderstood ; or lest it should be supposed I had conceded too much by this acknowledgment, I shall make one or two remarks upon it. Those ecclesiastical writers, who say there are but two orders

* Of one of his opponents Mr. Wesley said, "But what does this *smooth candid* writer endeavour to prove, with all the softness and good humour imaginable? Only this point (to express it in plain English) that I am a double-tongued knave, an old crafty hypocrite, saying one thing and meaning another." Wesley's works. Vol. X p. 452. In another place he says. "Neither do I conceal my sentiments. Few men less" p. 238. And yet Mr. E. says, "Mr. Wesley certainly intended that we should have *three orders*;" notwithstanding Mr. Wesley declared that there are but *two*. He says also that he recommended an "episcopacy in fact," although he was opposed to the "title" of bishop! In this way does the "*smooth candid*" Mr. E. make out the Rev. John Wesley, "a double-tongued knave," or "an old crafty hypocrite"

of ministers in the church of Christ, presbyters and deacons, frequently use the terms presbyter and bishop indifferently, as Mr. Wesley did, meaning that bishops and presbyters are the same order. Of this class, there are some, who sometimes use the term superintendent synonymously with bishop. But it ought to be noticed, that of those who maintain that there are three orders, bishops, presbyters and deacons, bishops and presbyters are never used synonymously, nor do they apply the term superintendents to their bishops. The former class admit the distinction which is laid down by Leigh in his *Critica Sacra*, "Between a bishop and presbyter there is, nevertheless, this difference. Presbyter is the name of an *order*, bishop is the name of an *office* in that order." And with this, agrees the statement of Lord King. "So that there were only the two orders of deacons and presbyters; the former whereof, being the inferior order, never sat at their ecclesiastical conventions, but like servants, stood and waited on the latter, who sat down on *thronoi* or seats in the form of a semicircle, whence they are frequently called *concessus presbyterii*, or the session of the presbytery: in which session he that was more peculiarly the bishop or minister of the parish, sat at the head of the semicircle, on a seat somewhat elevated above those of his *colleagues*, as Cyprian calls them; and so was distinguished from them, by his priority in the same order, but not by his being of another order." p. 74. "It was then judged necessary, that one man of distinguished gravity and wisdom should *preside* in the council of presbyters, in order to distribute among his colleagues their several tasks and to be a centre of union to the whole society." Mosheim. Vol. I. p. 103.

"The idea that equals," says Mr. E. "cannot, from among themselves, constitute an officer, who as *an officer* shall be superior to any of those, by whom he was constituted, is contradicted by all experience and history, both civil and ecclesiastical; and equally so by common sense. The contrary is too plain to require illustration." Def. p. 39. A little "illustration," however, may point out the fallacy of Mr. E's doctrine, and show its inapplicability to Methodist episcopacy. Let us suppose that a number of officers of the army, all *equal* in point of rank or *order*, agree to dine together upon a certain occasion; and when they are assembled, they appoint one of their body to *preside* at the dinner. This gentleman accepts the appointment, and accordingly takes his seat at the head of the table. Will any man, possessed of one grain of common sense, say, that this gentleman, by acting as president of the meeting, has been promoted to a superior rank or *order* than that to which he belonged when he sat down to table. Supposing, for instance, all were captains, did the president, who himself was a captain when he sat down, rise up a major? Or, if all were lieutenants, was the presiding lieutenant promoted, in consequence of his sitting at

the head of the table, to be a captain? "Illustration" shows the absurdity of Mr. E's doctrine, and its inapplicability to Methodist episcopacy; and proves there is not the least similarity, between the case of "equals" constituting, "from among themselves, an officer greater than themselves," and the case of a Methodist bishop. The appointment of the one was for that particular time only. He required no new commission to discharge the duties of president, he exercised no authority over his brother officers, nor was he raised to higher military rank in consequence of presiding at the festive board. Not so with a Methodist bishop, whom Mr. E. would pass off on us "*as an officer*" constituted such by his "*equals*." The moment he is "constituted" a bishop, he is a bishop for life; he obtains a new commission to enable him to discharge the duties of his new station; he exercises an authority over his brethren in the ministry that he never exercised before, and he is raised to a higher ecclesiastical rank or *order* in consequence of his being constituted a bishop.

It is well known, that there are many ministers and members of the Methodist episcopal church, who lay great stress upon the convertibility of the terms superintendent and bishop; and seem to consider, this circumstance alone, an argument sufficiently cogent to prove the validity of Methodist episcopacy. Mr. Wesley, say they, ordained Dr. Coke a superintendent, therefore he ordained him a bishop; for a bishop and a superintendent are synonymous terms. As this is a favourite topic with the friends of the episcopacy, I shall offer a few remarks, in addition to those already advanced upon the signification of these terms; and their distinct and peculiar application by ecclesiastical writers, to prove, that Mr. Wesley did not consider the terms as synonymous,* and surely Mr. Wesley must be allowed to know his own mind best.

Mr. Moore, in his life of Mr. Wesley, says, "with respect to the title of bishop, I *know* that Mr. Wesley enjoined the doctor and his associates, and in *the most solemn manner*, that it should not be taken. In a letter to Mrs. Gilbert, the widow of the excellent Nathaniel Gilbert Esq. of Antigua, a copy of which now lies before me, he states this in the strongest manner.† In this,

* In the British Minutes, Mr. William Black is entered a "general superintendent for the British dominions in America," from the year 1791, to the year 1808 inclusive: and yet, no one ever thought that Mr. Black was a bishop. From the year 1810 to the year 1812 inclusive, Dr. Coke stands on the British Minutes as "general superintendent of the Irish, Welsh, West India Nova-Scotia, and Newfoundland missions:" and yet nobody ever said that Dr. Coke by virtue of that appointment, was a bishop. The Rev. William Fosse is entered a "general superintendent for the Guernsey District for 1820:" yet Mr. Fosse is no bishop.

† I have written to Rev. Henry Moore, Mr. Wesley's biographer, for a copy of this letter; and for information upon other matters: but, as yet I have received no answer.

and in *every similar deviation*, I cannot be the apologist of Dr. Coke ; and I can state, in contradiction to all that Dr. Whitehead and Mr. Hampson have said, that Mr. Wesley *never gave his sanction* to any of these things ; nor was he the author of one line of all that Dr. Coke published in America, on this subject. His *views on these points*, were *very different* from those of his zealous son in the gospel." Moore's Life of Wesley. Vol. 2. p. 279 Now, admitting the truth of Mr. Moore's testimony, and Mr. E. himself, however much he may dislike it, does not dare to impugn it, will it not fairly and conclusively follow, that Mr. Wesley explained "his views," of this transaction, to Dr. Coke at the time he "*set*" him "*apart*" as a superintendent? That he pointed out to him the nature of the office he was to fill, and the particular work he was to perform? That he enlarged on these topics, so as to be perfectly understood by the doctor? That he enjoined him "and his associates in the most solemn manner that the title of bishop should not be taken ;" and yet, in the face of all this explanation, in despite of all this entreaty, in defiance of all this sacred and most "solemn" injunction, Dr. Coke assumed the title of bishop, formed the societies into an independent church, with the episcopal form of government, republished the Prayer Book, in which were the minutes of conference of this *episcopal* church, at his own expense, all of which were contrary to Mr. Wesley's "views" and wishes. It matters not with me, nor will it weigh a feather with any impartial man, what were Mr. Wesley's reasons for the abhorrence he felt to the title of bishop; (whether it was "because of the associations ordinarily connected with it in the public mind in England," Def. p. 47; as if the sphere of the doctor's ministrations, was to be England and not America, where there were no bishops at the time,) it was enough, that the doctor knew Mr. Wesley was opposed to it. I contend, therefore, let the reasons be what they may, that Dr. Coke was under the most solemn and sacred obligations to regard Mr. Wesley's advice. That he was bound by every principle of honor and honesty, in all good faith, rigidly to adhere to the instructions he had received. That in departing from them, he violated a most solemn injunction. That in doing this he rendered himself extremely culpable, and that his conduct therein cannot be defended by Mr. E. or a thousand such apologists.

If Mr. Wesley intended to impose the present episcopal form of government on the American Methodists ; and if his opposition was merely to the title of "bishop," I ask, would a trifling objection to a mere *title* have been consistent with his life and published opinions? If he considered the terms superintendent and bishop synonymous, let the term "superintendent" be substituted for "bishop," and let his letter to Mr. Asbury be read with this change, "Do not seek to be something. One instance of

this your greatness has given me great concern. How can you, how dare you suffer yourself to be called a *superintendent*? I start, I shudder at the very thought of your being called *superintendent*! Men may call me a *knave* or a *fool*, a *rascal* a *scoundrel*, and I am content; but they shall never, with my consent, call me a *superintendent*!" In what light would such a letter be considered, if addressed to the person who had been ordained a bishop by the writer, on the supposition that the writer considered the terms "*superintendent*" and "*bishop*" synonymous? It would have been, not only an insult to common sense, but it would have been downright wickedness.

But "the letter contains expressions *too severe*." Def. p. 47. So says a would-be-bishop. As I intend to take up these severe expressions again; I shall, in the mean time, only remark, that the severity of the expressions is a clear proof that Mr. Wesley knew the offence to be great. He knew what explanations he had given to Dr. Coke. He knew what objections he had to the episcopal form of government, and the title bishop. He knew the injunctions which had been solemnly imposed. On the supposition; that one term had only been substituted for another, of precisely the same import, the severity of the expressions are perfectly unjustifiable. Not so, however, if Mr. Wesley attributed the change to *ambition*, a desire to be "*great*;" "to a deviation from the simplicity which was in Christ;" to a disposition to "*strut*;" to a departure from his explicit instructions; to a violation of his "*most solemn injunctions*" and commands. Had such instructions been delivered by a sovereign to his minister plenipotentiary at a foreign court, and had such instructions been violated, would not the violation of them have subjected such minister plenipotentiary, to something more than "*severe expressions*," in reproof? Or if such commands had been delivered, by the commander in chief of an army, to any of his generals, or to any inferior officer, what would have been the sentence of a court martial, upon proof of the violation of those orders, I leave to military men to say.

That Mr. Wesley considered the offence to be great, may be argued from his using similar entreaties on another important occasion. At a certain time, some of the English Methodists were greatly harassed by persecutors. The benefits intended by the act of toleration were denied them. Mr. Wesley saw this with a degree of pain he seldom experienced. Considering it to be his duty to expostulate with those who were most zealous in this work, he wrote a letter to a prelate, in whose diocess this persecution most abounded; in which he says, "*O my Lord, for God's sake, for Christ's sake, for pity's sake, suffer the poor people to enjoy their religious, as well as civil liberty.*" Mr. Moore says, Mr. Wesley's letter to Mr. Asbury, "*clearly shows how much he felt that deviation from the simplicity which*

is in Christ," in the assumption of the title of bishop vol. 2 p. 285. The occasion in both instances was alarming; and he used nearly the very terms in the case of the persecution that he did respecting the title of bishop. Was the language to the persecuting bishop too strong? Was he opposed to persecution only in name? If this can be believed, then it may be believed, that all the objection he had to episcopacy, was to the title of bishop!!

The last thing to be noticed, is the performance of the ceremony of "setting apart" Dr. Coke to the office of a superintendent, which Mr. E. says was an ordination. "If this was not an ordination, we should be glad to be informed what constitutes one? It was performed as ordinations usually are; with the usual solemnities; by imposition of hands and prayer; with the assistance of other ordained ministers; and under the sanction of Almighty God. If it was not intended as an ordination, it was certainly a very solemn mockery; a trifling with sacred things, to charge Mr. Wesley with which, would be loading his memory with obloquy indeed." Def. p. 24. To this I answer, (1) that the precise meaning of ordination, according to Mr. Wesley's own declaration, is to be determined by the ordainer, not the ordained. Speaking of "the oath" he took, when he was ordained, he says, "The true sense of the words of an oath, and the mode and extent of its obligation, are not to be determined by him who takes it, but by him who requires it." Moore's Life of Wesley, vol. 1 p. 193. (2) Dr. Coke says, "nor do I think that the *repetition of the imposition of hands* for the same office, when important circumstances require it, is at all improper." Def. p. 90. He says farther, on the same page, "I am of our late venerable father Mr. Wesley's opinion, that the order of bishops and presbyters *are one and the same*." If Mr. Wesley had placed his hands upon the head of Dr. Coke five thousand times, he could not have raised him, by that ceremony, to any higher order than a presbyter; for according to Dr. Coke and Mr. Wesley's doctrine, a bishop and presbyter is "one and the same." (3) It was *not* "performed as ordinations usually are" Because, if Dr. Coke was ordained at all, he was ordained a bishop; a bishop and a superintendent, in the judgment of the advocates of Methodist episcopacy, being the same order. Not to repeat, what has been advanced already, upon the signification of these terms, and their respective use and application by ecclesiastical writers, I think Mr. E. cannot produce an instance of any *bishop* among episcopalians being ordained in the same manner that Dr. Coke was. The ceremony was performed in a private "chamber," by Mr. Wesley and another presbyter of the church of England, and by Mr. Whatcoat and Mr. Vasey, who, I believe, had been ordained elders, a few minutes previously, in the same "chamber." And yet Mr. E. has the te-

merity to say, Dr. Coke's ordination "was performed, as ordinations *usually* are." Mr. E. ought to know, that according to the usage of the church of England, when a bishop is ordained, his ordination is not performed in a private "chamber;" nor are there *usually* less than three bishops engaged in the performance of the ceremony. Nor was this ordination "performed as ordinations *usually*" were among the ancients. For, no bishop, taking the word as synonymous with presbyter as it respects *order*, but superior as it respects *office*, was inducted into that office, unless it were, by the suffrages of the clergy and *laity*, of that particular church, of which he was to have the immediate and pastoral care. Besides, it was necessary to have "the concurrent assent of the neighbouring bishops, and the imposition of the hands of at least three bishops." See Lord King, p. 46. 7. So that Dr. Coke's ordination was not performed according to either ancient or modern usage.

Mr. E. says farther, "it was performed by the imposition of hands and prayer." And suppose it was; will that constitute it an ordination? The reader will recollect that his attention was called to this subject in a former part of this work. He was told, from Mr. E's own authorities, that "imposition of hands does not confer any power on the person upon whom they are laid;" or in other words, that imposition of hands does not constitute ordination. If the imposition of hands does not constitute ordination, how could the imposition of Mr. Wesley's hands upon Dr. Coke constitute ordination, or create the doctor a bishop? And if Mr. Wesley's hands, who was the ordainer, in this ceremony, if any one was, did not constitute it an ordination, how could the hands of Mr. Creighton, Mr. Whatcoat, or Mr. Vasey make it an ordination? The thing is absurd; for a thousand noughts will not make an unit.

Nor is there the least reason for considering the "setting apart" of Dr. Coke, an ordination: no, not even the "exigence of necessity," which Mr. E. says, "Mr. Wesley assigned as one of the grounds of his proceeding." Def. p. 25. Surely Mr. E. does not understand the subject upon which he writes, or he confounds things which ought to be kept separate. Let the reader only distinguish between these two things. The supplying the American societies with ministers, to administer the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper; and the supposed creation of Dr. Coke a bishop. If the reader will distinguish between these two things, all that Mr. E. has said, or can say on the subject of the ordination of the doctor, is perfectly nugatory. Surely it was not *necessary* for Mr. Wesley to ordain Dr. Coke a bishop to authorise him to preach the gospel in America. It was not *necessary* to ordain him a bishop, in order to enable him to administer the ordinances to the Methodist societies in this country. It was not *necessary* to ordain him a bishop to authorise him to ordain ministers to administer baptism and the Lord's supper in the

United States. The two former the doctor had done in England; and the latter he had as good a clerical right to do, as Mr. Wesley himself. For Mr. Wesley declared that bishops and presbyters are equal, and consequently have the *same right* to ordain. The validity of the ordination of Mr. Whatcoat and Mr. Vasey being allowed, on the ground set up by Mr. Wesley as a justification of his own conduct, namely that *presbyters* have a right to ordain; these three gentlemen could certainly ordain others, without supposing one of them to be a third order, distinct from and superior to presbyters; and thus they could have supplied the societies with ministers. The only difficulty which presented itself in the case, grew out of the great affection which the American societies cherished for Mr. Wesley; and the objections they had to receive any person, whose appointment did not come from him, as "the father of the whole Methodist family." To overcome this difficulty, and to induce them to receive Dr. Coke, Mr. Wesley thought proper to "set apart" Dr. Coke as a superintendent, by the imposition of his hands and prayer, and this is what Mr. E. has magnified into an "ordination" of a bishop.

To put this matter to rest, I shall offer Mr. Wesley's opinion of a transaction exactly similar in all its parts. I allude to that which is recorded in Acts XIII. ch. 2, 3 verses. "As they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed and *laid their hands* on them, they sent them away." Now, the transaction in Acts so much resembles the one under consideration, that neither Mr. E. nor any one else can point out any material difference. The one was intended for a *special purpose*; so was the other. The one was performed "*by the imposition of hands and prayer*;" so was the other. The one was performed by "*ordained ministers*;" so was the other. The one "*was done under the protection of Almighty God*;" so was the other.

Before I offer Mr. Wesley's opinion, I shall repeat what I said in my History and Mystery in reply to Rev. Mr. Bangs's sentiments on this passage. This Rev. gentleman in his "Vindication of Methodist episcopacy,"* p. 42. has these words: "But

* In the Methodist Magazine for September, 1827, p. 396; Mr. Bangs says "how changed is the author of the History and Mystery of Methodist Episcopacy, from what he was when he heard read, approved and recommended for publication, at the Methodist book room, the "Vindication of Methodist Episcopacy." He need not attempt to deny this fact, because it stands attested by his own signature, as secretary of the book committee." Mr. E. makes pretty much, the same statement, in the preface to his book. Knowing these statements to be untrue, I wrote to a friend in New York, to procure me a copy of the records of the book committee in the case. The following is certified to be a true copy

"September 8, 1820.

"Brother Bangs, this day closed reading before the committee, an essay entitled A Vindication of Methodist Episcopacy

says the objector, have presbyters authority to constitute a minister superior to themselves? Undoubtedly. It will be admitted that the apostles were a grade of ministers superior to the elders; and yet St. Paul was *ordained* by a body of elders." From this answer we are justified in supposing that the author of the Vindication of Methodist episcopacy thought St. Paul was *not* an apostle before this transaction; and that he was rais-

1. On motion, it was resolved, that the committee approve of its publication

2. Resolved that the above work be recommended to the book agents for publication.

ALEXANDER M CAINE "

I will now give a brief history of this affair, according to the best of my recollection. When Mr. Bangs first mentioned his contemplated work to the brethren who composed the book committee, I understood him to mention it to them, not in their official capacity as the book committee; but as individuals, of whose presence he said he would avail himself, and upon whose judgement he could rely. Having mentioned it just as they were about to disperse; I had no knowledge, that Mr. Bangs had previously submitted his views upon this subject, to Mr. Soule, his predecessor in the book room, for publication; nor was the slightest intimation given of the fact, that his former piece had been rejected. As Mr. Bangs produced only a few sheets of his manuscript, (say three or four,) I thought that this was the first time he had written anything on the subject. One of the brethren upon hearing him read what he had produced, observed, he could form no opinion of the merits of the work from a few sheets. He told Mr. Bangs, he had better go on with it, and when he had finished it, he could then tell him what he thought of it. The next time any portion of it was read, I considered the matter in the same point of light; and consequently, as I did not suppose that it was submitted to the committee, *in their official capacity*, or that they would be responsible for its doctrines I did not make a stern opposition to many things, of which I did not approve. How many times Mr. Bangs read portions of his manuscript, I cannot say. I have no recollection of being present more than twice or thrice. Having finished reading his paper the above resolutions were then submitted to the committee, which it became my duty, as secretary, to record. But surely it will not follow, because I entered them on the book, that I approved of, or recommended the work. As well might Mr. Bangs say, that I "recommended" the resolutions he offered at the general conference of 1820, because I was secretary to that body. Or that Mr. Emory "approved" of every thing done at the general conference of 1824, because he was secretary to that conference. The fact is; Mr Bangs *deceived* me in the way he introduced his work to the brethren. He *deceived* me in holding back the information, that this work had been rejected by Mr. Soule, his predecessor: a circumstance which I did not know for years afterwards. He *deceived* me in the manner in which he obtained a vote for its publication, and now he says I "approved and recommended it." He must allow me to tell him this is not true. He also says, "this is not mentioned to criminate him." For what other purpose is it mentioned? Notwithstanding what he says, I must believe that Mr. Bangs did mention it to criminate me, and for no other purpose. Really, I once thought Mr. Bangs was above such dirty little tricks as these; but I find I have been *mistaken* in the man. Perhaps he will next say, I voted that he should have the HUNDRED DOLLARS which he received from his colleague, Thomas Mason, for the copy right of "a Vindication of Methodist Episcopacy."!!! In my conscience, I think, he ought to return that sum to the book room, for the work, for which he obtained it, ~~for it~~ is not worth a dollar. Help, brethren, help. The profits of the book room go to the.....spread of the Gospel.

ed to be an apostle by the imposition of the hands of those *prophets* and *teachers*, whom he calls *elders*. All this, however, is in flat contradiction to what St. Paul himself tells us. He says, he was an apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father. Gal. I ch. 1 ver. Dr. McNight in his comment on the text says, "St. Paul was first made an apostle by Christ, when he appeared to him in the way to Damascus, Acts IX. 15. And three years after that his apostolic commission was renewed. Acts XXII 20. So that he was first sent forth, neither by the church at Jerusalem, nor by that at Antioch. The Holy Ghost, indeed, ordered the prophets at Antioch (Acts XIII. 2) to separate Paul and Barnabas; but it was to the work whereunto he had called them formerly. This separation was simply a recommending them to the grace of God by prayer. And in fact it is so termed. Acts XIV. 26" So that in Dr. McNight's opinion, the "setting apart" by the imposition of hands and prayer is no ordination, but simply a recommending of those, on whom they were placed to the grace of God by prayer. Now for Mr. Wesley's opinion.

"I believe several who are not *episcopally ordained*, are called of God to preach the gospel. Yet I have no objection to the twenty third article, though I judge there are exempt cases."

"That the seven deacons were outwardly ordained, even to that low office cannot be denied. But when St. Paul and Barnabas were separated for the work to which they were called, this was *not ordaining* them. St. Paul was ordained long before, and that not of man nor by man. It was only *inducting* him to the province for which our Lord had appointed him from the beginning. For this end, the prophets and teachers fasted, prayed, and laid their hands upon them: a rite which was used *not in ordination only*, but in blessing, and on *many other occasions*." Wesley's works, vol. X. p. 237. See also his Notes on the New Testament *in loc.* and on the Acts XIV. 26. If Mr. E. should exclaim respecting this transaction, as he has done respecting the "imposition" of Mr. Wesley's "*hands*" upon Dr. Coke, "if it was not an ordination, it was certainly a very solemn mockery." Def. p. 24. Mr. Wesley will be allowed to be as competent to decide upon the subject as Mr. E. is. Had Mr. E's knowledge been greater, or his pretensions less, he "certainly" would not have declared, that "if the imposition of hands, upon Dr. Coke, was not an ordination, it was a very solemn mockery."



SECTION VI.—Dr. Coke's letter to Bishop White.

Dr. Coke's letter to Bishop White is a document of too much importance, and too closely connected with the subject under

discussion. not to have a place in this work. It develops the principles, by which some of the chief actors in the organization of the Methodist episcopal church were influenced :—it contains concessions and acknowledgments, which no minister of Jesus Christ, who was unconscious of having done wrong, ought to make : it offers proposals which no bishop, having a proper respect for the dignity of his episcopal character, and a conviction of the validity of his ordination, ought to offer : and it stands, and will for ever stand, as a proof of the jealousy and rivalry of the two superintendents, or bishops, and of the artifice and intrigue used by the one, to gain an ascendancy over the other.

The following is a copy of his letter attested by bishop White.
 “ *Right Reverend Sir* :—

Permit me to intrude a little on your time, upon a subject of great importance.

You, I believe, are conscious that I was brought up in the church of England, and have been ordained a presbyter of that church. For many years I was prejudiced, even I think, to bigotry, in favor of it : but through a variety of causes and incidents, to mention which would be tedious and useless, my mind was exceedingly biassed on the other side of the question. In consequence of this, I am not sure but I went further *in the separation* of our church in America, than Mr. Wesley, from whom I had received my commission, did intend. He did indeed solemnly invest me, as far as he had a right so to do, with episcopal authority, but did not intend, I think, that our entire separation should take place. He being pressed by our friends on this side the water, for ministers to administer the sacraments to them (there being very few clergy of the church of England then in the States) *he went farther, I am sure, than he would have gone if he had foreseen some events which followed.* And this I am certain of—*that he is now sorry for the separation.*

But what can be done for a re-union which I wish for ; and to accomplish which, Mr. Wesley, I have no doubt, would use his influence to the utmost ? The affection of a very considerable number of the preachers and most of the people, is very strong towards him ; notwithstanding *the excessive ill usage he received from a few.* My interest also is not small ; and both his and mine would readily and to the utmost, be used to accomplish that (to us) very desirable object : if a readiness were shown by the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal church to re-unite.

It is even to your church an object of great importance. We have now above 60,000 adults in our society in these States ; and about 250 travelling ministers and preachers ; besides a great number of local preachers, very far exceeding the number of travelling preachers ; and some of these local preachers are men of very considerable abilities ; but if we number the Methodists

as most people number the members of their church, viz.—by the families which constantly attend the divine ordinances in their places of worship, they will make a larger body than you possibly conceive. The society, I believe, may be safely multiplied by five on an average, to give us our stated congregations ; which will then amount to 300,000. And if, the calculation, which, I think some eminent writers have made, be just, that three-fifths of mankind are un-adult (if I may use the expression) at any given period, it will follow that all the families, the adults of which form our congregations in these states, amount to 750,000. About one-fifth of these are blacks.

The work now extends in length from Boston to the South of Georgia ; and in breadth, from the Atlantic to lake Champlain, Vermont, Albany, Redstone, Holstein, Kentucky, Cumberland, &c.

But there are many hindrances in the way. Can they be removed?

1. Our ordained ministers will not, ought not, to give up their right of administering the sacraments. I don't think that the generality of them, perhaps none of them, would refuse to submit to a re-ordination, if other hindrances were removed out of the way. I must here observe, that between 60 and 70 only, out of the two hundred and fifty have been ordained presbyters, and about 60 deacons (only.) The presbyters are the choicest of the whole.

2. The other preachers would hardly submit to re-union, if the possibility of their rising up to ordination depended on the present bishops in America. Because, though they are all, I think I may say, zealous, pious and very useful men, yet they are not acquainted with the learned languages. Besides, they would argue, if the present bishops would waive the article of the learned languages, yet their successors might not.

My desire of a re-union is so sincere and earnest, that these difficulties make me tremble : and *yet something must be done before the death of Mr. Wesley, otherwise I shall despair of success*: for though my influence among the Methodists in these states as well as in Europe, is, I doubt not, increasing, yet *Mr. Asbury whose influence is very capital, will not easily comply, nay, I know he will be exceedingly averse to it.*

In Europe where some steps had been taken, tending to a separation, all is at an end. Mr. Wesley is a determined enemy of it, and I have lately borne an open and successful testimony against it.

Shall I be favoured with a private interview with you in Philadelphia? I shall be there, God willing, on Tuesday the 17th of May. If this be agreeable, I'll beg of you just to signify it in a note directed to me at Mr. Jacob Baker's, merchant, Market street, Philadelphia : or if you please by a few lines

sent me by the return of the post, at Philip Rogers's Esq. in Baltimore, from yourself or Dr. Magaw: and I will wait upon you with my friend Dr. Magaw. We can then enlarge on the subjects.

I am conscious of it that secrecy is of great importance in the present state of the business, till the minds of you, your brother bishops and Mr. Wesley be circumstantially known. I must therefore beg that these things be confined to yourself and Dr. Magaw, till I have the honor of seeing you.

Thus you see that I have made a bold venture on your honor and candour, and have opened my whole heart to you on the subject as far as the extent of a small letter will allow me. If you put equal confidence in me, you will find me candid and faithful.

I have, notwithstanding, been guilty of inadvertencies. Very lately I found myself obliged (for the pacifying of my conscience) to write a penitential letter to the Rev. Mr. Jarrat, which gave him great satisfaction: and for the same reason I must write another to the Rev. Mr. Pettigrew.

When I was last in America, I prepared and corrected a great variety of things for our magazine, indeed almost every thing that was printed, except some loose hints which I had taken of one of my journeys, and which I left in my hurry with Mr. Asbury, without any correction, entreating him that no part of them might be printed which could be improper or offensive. But through great inadvertency (I suppose) he suffered some reflections on the characters of the two above mentioned gentlemen to be inserted in the magazine, for which I am very sorry: and probably shall not rest till I have made my acknowledgments more public; though Mr. Jarrat does not desire it.

I am not sure, whether I have not also offended you, sir, by accepting one of the offers made me by you and Dr. Magaw of the use of your churches, about six years ago, on my first visit to Philadelphia, without informing you of *our plan of separation from the Church of England*. If I did offend, [as I doubt I did, especially from what you said to Mr. Richard Dallam of Abingdon] I sincerely beg yours and Dr. Magaw's pardon. I'll endeavor to amend. But alas! I am a frail, weak creature.

I will intrude no longer at present. One thing only I will claim from your candour—that if you have no thought of improving this proposal, you will burn this letter, and take no more notice of it, (for it would be a pity to have us entirely alienated from each other, if we cannot unite in the manner my ardent wishes desire) but if you will further negotiate the business, I will explain my mind still more fully to you on the probabilities of success.

In the mean time, permit me, with great respect, to subscribe myself, Right Reverend Sir,

Your very humble servant in Christ,

[Signed]

THOMAS COKE.

The Right Reverend Father in God,

BISHOP WHITE.

Richmond, April 24th, 1791.

P. S. You must excuse interlineations, &c. I am just going into the country and have no time to transcribe."

Upon this letter, I shall now make a few remarks. 1. Dr. Coke informs bishop White, "that he had been brought up in the church of England; had been ordained a presbyter in that church; and, for many years, had been prejudiced, even to bigotry, in favor of it." 2. He acknowledges that a great change had taken place in his views, and says, "that through a variety of causes and incidents, which it would be useless to mention, my mind was exceedingly biassed on the other side of the question." 3. Whilst in this state, he adds, "*I went further in the separation of our church in America, than Mr. Wesley, from whom I had received my commission, did intend.*" 4. Having mentioned his "*commission*," he enlarges on that topic and adds, "Mr. Wesley did indeed solemnly invest me with episcopal authority, as far as he had a right so to do."

Respecting this most extraordinary investiture with episcopal authority, I shall remark, (1.) That the reader can find nothing like this account, in any ecclesiastical writer. No man claiming episcopal authority, ever, before, expressed himself in this manner (2) Notwithstanding all Mr. E's confident assertions respecting Dr. Coke's "having no doubt, not the shadow of a doubt," of the validity of his ordination as a bishop, it is worthy of remark, that the doctor does not say one word, about his being ordained a bishop. Is it not a matter of just surprise, that he should carefully avoid mentioning his being ordained a bishop, provided he knew, that he had been ordained one. His backwardness to use the term "ordained," and his substituting the novel, and periphrastical mode of expression, "he did indeed solemnly invest me with episcopal authority," is proof to my mind, that the doctor could not say he was *ordained a bishop*; nor use the same unequivocal language that he did, when speaking of his being "ordained a presbyter" in the church of England. (3) As he had been called a bishop so long; as he had been accessory to the organization of the societies into an episcopal church; as he had with Mr. Asbury his colleague, assumed the title of bishop, he seems to have wished, if possible, to retain the title, and yet he declines saying he was ordained a bishop. For, when writing to one, who was himself a bishop, in the common acceptation of that term; who had been constituted a bishop, according to ecclesiastical usage: who was ac-

quainted with the duties of the office, the meaning of the term, and the manner in which a bishop is ordained, Dr. Coke expresses himself in a manner that is truly surprising. Truth will not allow him to say he was ordained a bishop, and yet he says, he was "invested with episcopal authority." Never was any man placed in a more awkward position, by the pen of his adversary, than Dr. Coke is placed in by his own pen. Nor is this all. For (4) the latter part of the sentence is not a whit behind the former in absurdity; and this absurdity is attempted to be placed to Mr. Wesley's account, by "his zealous son in the gospel." Hear the doctor again. "Mr. Wesley did indeed solemnly invest me with episcopal authority, *as far as he had a right so to do.*" Much might be said on the phrase, "as far as he had a right so to do;" but I shall only make one or two remarks. 1. Mr. Wesley had a *right* to ordain Dr. Coke a bishop, or he had not. If he had this right, why does the doctor express himself in such a way as to make this right questionable? If he had this right; there was no need of the restrictive phrase, "*as far as he had a right so to do.*" 2. But, if Mr. Wesley had not this right, why, in the name of common sense does the doctor say, "he did invest me with episcopal authority." To common readers the whole matter must be glaringly absurd; in what light then, must the affair have appeared to the gentleman to whom this letter was addressed? Bishop White knew what was the voice of ecclesiastical history, respecting the office of a bishop, the meaning of the term, the equality of the order, in "office and power," and the established manner of ordaining one. Dr. Coke knew, or ought to have known these things as well as bishop White. Ecclesiastical writers had asserted, "that wherever a bishop be, whether at Rome, or at Eugubium, at Constantinople or at Rhegium, at Alexandria, or at Thanis; he is of the same worth and of the same priesthood: the force of wealth or lowness of poverty doth not render a bishop more high or more low. That one bishop might exceed another in splendor; in wealth, in reputation, in extent of jurisdiction, as one king may surpass another in amplitude of territory; but as all kings, so all bishops are equal in office and essentials of power." And yet with a knowledge of these facts, he uses the restrictive phrase "*as far as he had a right so to do.*"!!

The doctor, who candidly states that he "went farther in the separation than Mr. Wesley intended," thereby confessing that he had not conformed to the instructions he had received, but had violated injunctions most solemnly imposed, now attempts to throw a little of the blame upon Mr. Wesley himself. "Mr. Wesley did not intend that our *entire* separation (from the church) should take place; he went farther, than he would have gone, if he had foreseen some events which followed." It now remains to be ascertained what those steps were, which Mr.

Wesley had taken, calculated to produce a separation, and which he would not have taken, if he had foreseen the events which followed. And what could these steps have been, but the ordaining of ministers for the American Methodists. This circumstance made them independent of the clergy of other denominations, for ordination and the ordinances. In consequence of this, the Methodist preachers felt their independence, and as a proof of it, their first act was to form themselves into an independent church. Mr. Wesley, too, was soon made to *feel*, that they were perfectly independent of him also, and that they cared for him, no more, than they did for any other person. The first time he interfered in their business, by merely advising, that Mr. Whatcoat might be appointed joint superintendent with Mr. Asbury, they were offended at his interference, and discarded him and his authority at a stroke, by leaving his name off their minutes. Well might Dr. Coke say, this was "excessive ill usage;" but for the honor of the conference, only "a few" had any thing to do in it. Still, it is highly probable, that Mr. Wesley would not have ordained ministers for the American societies, if he had thought, that almost one of their first acts would have been to treat himself in this manner. Notwithstanding all the palliating glosses of Mr. E. their treatment of Mr. Wesley will find no apologists or admirers, in men of honorable minds. The doctor farther tells bishop White, that he is "certain Mr. Wesley is sorry for the separation." If Mr. Wesley was sorry for the separation, was he not also sorry for having taken the steps that led to it? Was he not sorry for having ordained ministers for America? That he was sorry for having ordained some of his preachers for Great Britain, we have Rev. Mr. Creighton's testimony: and if he was sorry for having ordained a few of them, for Great Britain, how much greater reason had he to be sorry for having ordained preachers for America? In reply to Mr. Bradburn, Mr. Creighton says, "I must take the liberty positively to contradict you.—He did repent of it" (ordaining them) "and with *tears* in his eyes expressed his sorrow both in public and private." Again he says, "He likewise expressed his sorrow respecting this matter at Leeds conference, in 1789, and occasionally afterwards in London until his death." p. 13.

Having made these statements and concessions, the doctor next expresses his wish for a re-union with the Protestant Episcopal church; and says, "both Mr. Wesley's interest and mine would readily, and to the utmost, be used to accomplish that (to us) very desirable object." He, moreover, presses the subject upon the bishop, from the consideration that Mr. Wesley could not be expected to live much longer. "Something must be done before the death of Mr. Wesley, otherwise I shall despair of success." But where is Mr. Asbury all this time? Has he

nothing to do with the Methodist societies, or is he not considered worthy to be consulted in such important matters? The doctor, it is true, does mention his name in the letter, but not with approbation, or as being likely to concur in the measure. For although, the doctor says, "that he doubted not but his influence among the Methodists in these states is increasing: yet *Mr. Asbury whose influence is very capital, will not easily comply, nay, I know he will be exceedingly averse to it.*" Well might the doctor say so; for Mr. Asbury would have no rival, much less a superior. He acted out the sentiments expressed to Mr. Shadford, "Mr. Wesley and I are like Cæsar and Pompey. He will bear no equal, and I will bear no superior." However, take it on the whole, and it exhibits a pretty specimen of brotherly affection! A delightful example of mutual confidence and co-operation between the two Methodist bishops! "Interest" opposed to "interest." "Influence" working against "influence;" the one striving to counteract and undermine the other. Well may some in the Methodist episcopal church be ashamed of such conduct. Well may they say, that "such things are calculated to disgrace and bring reproach upon its ministers and members." But in the name of Heaven am I answerable for this? Am I the author of this letter? Did I forge it? Did not Dr. Coke write it? Why then expel me the church for republishing it? It was surely worse to write it, than to publish it; and yet, the very men, who preferred the charges against me, for which I have been ex-communicated, pretend to defend the doctor's conduct in applauding the "Defence of our Fathers," and heartily approve of my expulsion!!

The doctor, in the exposition of his plan, adds, "I am conscious of it, that secrecy is of great importance in the present state of the business, till the minds of you, your brother bishops, and Mr. Wesley be circumstantially known: I must therefore beg that these things be confined to yourself and Dr. Magaw till I have the honor of seeing you. One thing only I will claim from your candor, that if you have no thoughts of improving this proposal, you will burn this letter." Now what would any man, who was associated with another in mercantile pursuits, think of his partner, if that partner were to conduct himself towards him, as Dr. Coke did towards Mr. Asbury? "*Burn this letter*" would be sufficient to excite indignation in the breast of any man. But instead of contemplating these gentlemen as men of the world, bound to each other, only by the ties of interest and honor, they must be contemplated in a much higher point of view, as joint superintendents in the Methodist episcopal church. They are to be regarded as bishops or overseers of a part of the flock of Christ, and ostensibly labouring, mutually and affectionately, to promote its welfare. Standing in this relation to one another, they travel together for several days, after the letter

was written : they converse together, pray together, preach together, eat and sleep together, and the one has not confidence in his colleague to say one word to him about the re-union!! Is there any thing to surpass this in the history of the Popes ? How must Mr. Asbury have felt when he received, opened, and read bishop White's answer to the doctor's letter, which fell into his hands ? Is it not reasonable to suppose that he was thunder-struck with surprise; and indignant at such conduct ? That he was ready to cry out treachery, deception, intrigue and a thousand things besides ? Nor is it strange, that in a letter written subsequently, and now lying before me, he should say "I cannot confide in ecclesiasticks passing through the degrees, and *intrigues* of a university, as I can trust a ploughman."

A personal interview had been proposed with bishop White, upon Dr. Coke's arrival in Philadelphia. This interview, accordingly took place; at which the parties, Dr. Coke, bishop White and Dr. Magaw enlarged on the subjects mentioned in the letter. "The general outlines of Dr. Coke's plan" says bishop White, "were a re-ordination of the methodist ministers, their continuing under the superintendence, then existing, and the consecration of himself and the gentleman connected with him." But says Mr. E. "bishop White mistook the import of Dr. Coke's letter," Def. p. 30. Although bishop White could not understand it, it will be recollected, that Mr. E. can !! This assertion if taken in connexion with another, on the same page, in the Defence of our Fathers, is only a *genteel* way of setting aside bishop White's testimony as utterly unworthy of credit. "This suggestion" (respecting consecration) "as far as we can discover, is not to be found in Dr. Coke's letter" *ib.* And will Mr. E. say, that because this "suggestion" is not found in Dr. Coke's letter, *therefore* it was not made in the conversations which took place at the personal interview. Mr. E. ought to be ashamed of such insinuations, against such a man as bishop White. And is it possible, that Mr. E. could have the vanity to think, that his assertion would be believed, namely, that a man of bishop White's acknowledged acuteness of perception, talents, age, standing in the literary world, and high station in the church, could not understand Dr. Coke's letter ? The fact is, any man can understand it; for it is so plain, it can not be misunderstood. But this is not the first time bishop White has received rude treatment from this pragmatistical writer, who inflated with his own little acquirements, seems to think, that nobody can understand the most simple proposition, or tell how many two and two make, but himself.

Notwithstanding Mr. E's dexterity in the management of documents, this letter sadly perplexes him. He can neither bend it, nor break it; he must therefore dispose of it in the best manner he can. He affects to represent the doctor's application for

consecration, as a mere trifle, by comparing his offer, with the conduct of "some Methodist presbyters, who have joined other churches." "It is well known", says he, "that some methodist presbyters, who have joined other churches, have submitted to a second ordination, not for their own satisfaction, but for the satisfaction of others, and *because it was required of them in order to the union*" Def. p. 29. *First*. Is not this declaration contrary to the universal sense of mankind? According to Mr. E's doctrine, when a beggar asks an alms, it is not "for his own satisfaction," but for the satisfaction of the giver, that he asks it ! When an applicant solicits a favor, it is not "for his own satisfaction," he solicits it, but for the satisfaction of his benefactor ! When a man wishes to become a member of a religious society, it is not "for his own satisfaction," that he wishes to join it, but for the satisfaction of the church ! According to this position, it is the party *applying*, who confers the favor, and not the party *bestowing* it. And yet the book containing such nonsense is pronounced "a masterly and unanswerable production." *Second*. Did not the churches which these "Methodist presbyters" joined, deny the validity of their ordination, as "Methodist presbyters," by requiring them to submit to a second ordination ? They did. And if Dr. Coke's offer had been accepted, and if he had been "consecrated" by the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal church, this circumstance would have been considered, by every church in the United States, a renunciation of what has been called, his episcopal ordination. But Mr. E. says, "It is well known" &c. To whom ? I have known the Methodist episcopal church for 37 years ; and I know it as well, and better, than Mr. E. does, and I never knew it to allow such a plea as he states. So far from it, that I have known some "Methodist presbyters, who left the Methodist episcopal church and joined other churches," and I have always heard one of two things assigned as a reason for their submitting to a second ordination, namely the invalidity of their ordination, or the prospect of *improving their temporal circumstances*. Now, although some *one* of these "Methodist presbyters" may say, it "was not for his own satisfaction" that he submitted to a "second ordination," his apology has not been admitted by the ministers or members of the Methodist episcopal church. This would be to acknowledge the invalidity of Methodist ordination, which would be a kind of ecclesiastical suicide or *felo de-se*. The Methodists, therefore, have, in every instance, that I have known or heard of, attributed submitting to a second ordination to a love of *gain*. And has Mr. E. in his "masterly defence" placed Dr. Coke in this predicament ? Does he really think, that the doctor was that *venal, sordid* soul that his readers are left to infer he was, by representing his application to bishop White, as "a case analagous" to the above ? Does Mr. E. attribute his proposals to the love of *pelf*, rather

than admit that the doctor did not believe he was a bishop? Mr. E. may choose either horn of the dilemma. In the meantime, I shall close this paragraph with a sentence from his own book. "The propensity of the human mind to conjecture what is most accordant with *its own habits of thinking*, or what is best calculated to support *its own views* is too well known, to require discussion here." Def. p. 30.

Were Mr. E. a fair and honourable controvertist; and were his sole object, truth, he never would allow himself to practise what he condemns in others. With the rules of controversy, he is presumed to be too well acquainted, not to know, that conjecture is not argument; and that specious phantasies are very different from logical deductions. But keeping these deductions out of sight, he abounds in "conjectures" upon the subject of this letter; thereby "demonstrating" how hard run he is for argument, and how difficult it is for him to dispose of it, with any degree of plausibility, to please himself. A few instances shall serve as a specimen of his logical precision. "Dr. Coke *might* not have considered it wrong." "Bishop White *might have misapprehended* a hint." "It must be admitted to be *possible*, that he *might, at least, equally*." "Bishop White was *conjecturing*." "Dr. Coke had *probably* contemplated." "It was *conjectural*. As such we leave it." "Bishop White *may have been correct*." "*It may* easily be accounted for without supposing." "Dr. Coke *might have thought it*." "We *conjecture*, if Dr. Coke did." "Bishop White *mistook*." And, if I do not mistake, the reader will acknowledge, he never saw such a sample of conjectures, in the same space, in any book before. No wonder it has been pronounced by the seven wise men as "unanswerable;" for it is so full of nonsense, conjecture, and contradiction that no man can tell what to answer.

I shall not attempt to follow Mr. E. through those airy regions of conjecture, whither he allowed himself to be carried by his fancy, or his cunning: but shall turn to an other subject—the subject of Mr. Wesley's death, which is closely connected with the writing of this letter. Mr. E. says, "the fact is, that Mr. Wesley at the time" (of writing this letter) "was dead." Def. p. 32. For what purpose does Mr. E. aver this fact? To refute a statement made by Dr. Wyatt of Baltimore in a sermon which he published, that Dr. Coke's proposal to bishop White, "was made with the approbation, if not direction of Mr. Wesley." Not so, says Mr. E. that could not be, for "Mr. Wesley at the time was dead." Dr. Coke, at the time he wrote his letter to bishop White, knew, that Mr. Wesley was dead, or he did not. If he did know it, Mr. E.'s assertion is a pitiful equivocation, and does not disprove, what Dr. Wyatt said: for surely Mr. Wesley might have given his approbation to these proposals before he died; though I am very far from supposing he did.

But if Mr. Wesley's death was known to Dr. Coke, before he wrote this letter, as Mr. E's phraseology would lead a person to suppose it was, then Mr. E. has fixed a stain of the deepest die, on the character of Dr. Coke, which neither he, nor all he can call to his assistance, can ever wipe away. For, although the doctor, according to Mr. E's statement, is supposed to know of the death of Mr. Wesley, yet he says, "to accomplish which, Mr. Wesley, I have no doubt, would use his influence to the utmost." Again, "something must be done before the death of Mr. Wesley."

To clear up this matter, and to do justice to Dr. Coke, I turned to Drew's life of Coke, and found the following account. "Dr. Coke," says Mr. Drew, "had been preaching on the evening of the 20th of April, at a place, called Port Royal, in Virginia, and had engaged to preach, about twelve miles distant, at ten o'clock on the ensuing morning. But on returning after the evening preaching, to the house of a merchant where he was to lodge, he was informed by him, that the Philadelphian papers had just announced to the public, the death of Mr. Wesley. Astonished at this intelligence, and unwilling to credit what he hoped might be false, he requested the gentleman to procure for him, a sight of the paper. This was soon done: and on perusing the paragraph, he was convinced, from the manner of its being written, that the unexpected tidings were mournfully true. . . . The next morning he set off for New-York. . . . On his arrival at Alexandria, he received a letter from home, confirming the truth of what the papers had circulated. . . . He reached Baltimore by Sunday the 1st of May, and preached, in the evening, to a crowded audience, on the mournful occasion." Drew's Life of Coke, p. 231.

Here every thing is plain, clear, and circumstantial. But what bearing, it may be asked, has this account upon Dr. Coke's letter to bishop White? It has this: allowing Mr. Drew to be correct in his date, it will prove, that Dr. Coke knew of Mr. Wesley's death, before he wrote his letter to bishop White. According to the above account, the news of Mr. Wesley's death reached the doctor on the 20th, and he wrote his letter on the 24th of the same month.

But Mr. Drew is not correct. And in proof of it I offer the following testimony. Mr. Asbury says: "Thursday 28 (April.) We hasted to Port Royal, where a number of fine people were waiting, to whom the doctor preached on "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God"

"Friday 29. The solemn news reached our ears that the public papers had announced the death of that dear man of God, John Wesley. . . Dr. Coke, accompanied by brother C—— and Dr. G—— set out for Baltimore, in order to get the most speedy passage to England, leaving me to fill the appointments.

Next day I overtook Dr. Coke and his company at Colchester. At Alexandria Dr Coke had certain information of Mr Wesley's death. On Sabbath day he reached Baltimore, and preached on the occasion of Mr Wesley's death; and mentioned some things which gave offence.* *Asbury's Journal*, Vol. 2. pp. 99. 100.

I have searched the newspapers of that year, preserved in the Baltimore Library, and find the account of Mr. Wesley's death, taken from a Liverpool paper of March 3d. 1791, and copied into the "Gazette of the United States, of Saturday, April 23. 1791 published by John Fenno, No. 69. High-Street, Philadelphia," in the following words. JOHN WESLEY. On Tuesday evening, died of a gradual decay, the Rev. John Wesley, in the 88th year of his age" &c. The same account may be found in the Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser, under date of April 26th 1791.

Having ascertained Mr Drew's account to be incorrect, there were a few things concerning the death of Mr. Wesley, connected with this letter, on which I was anxious to obtain information; and which I was certain I could obtain from no other quarter, but from bishop White himself. I, accordingly, waited on this gentleman, last May, when I was in Philadelphia, and stated to him the object of my visit. The bishop received me with the greatest politeness, and answered my questions with the greatest promptness. The points respecting which I made inquiry were these. *First*. Did he believe, that Dr. Coke knew of the death of Mr. Wesley, when he wrote his letter of April 24th. *Second*. Was there any mention made, of the death of Mr. Wesley, at the interview which took place between Dr. Coke, bishop White, and Dr. Magaw? *Third*. Bishop White having stated, that mention was made of Mr. Wesley's death, I then asked, did Dr. Coke withdraw, or propose to withdraw the proposals for a re-union with the Protestant Episcopal church, which he had made in his letter; and to effect which, he "had no doubt," he said, "Mr. Wesley would use his influence to the utmost"? On these points the bishop was explicit and full. But on my return to Baltimore, it occurred to me, that it would be best, for several reasons, to have the bishop's answers to my questions, in writing. I therefore addressed him a letter, dated the 1st of August, and received the following answer on the 5th of the same month. How unlike the conduct of the Methodist bishops, to whom I addressed my circular, dated "Baltimore July 1st, 1826," and from whom, I have not received a single line, or word in answer to the present time.

* When Dr. Coke published this sermon, he omitted every thing that had given offence when it was delivered.

Rev'd. Sir.

Philad. August 4th, 1828.

I have received your letter of the 1st inst. In answer to which I have to inform you that you do not seem to have misunderstood my answers to the questions proposed by you to me personally in our interview.

When Dr. Coke addressed to me the letter to which you refer, he could not have known of the death of Mr. Wesley, which was an event of too signal a character, not to be discoursed of, immediately on the arrival of the tidings of it. I am persuaded, there was no knowledge of it in Philadelphia, when I wrote my answer to the aforesaid letter. Dr. Coke was informed of it, between the date of his letter and the arrival of mine. All the circumstances of the case, induce on my mind the persuasion, that on the receipt of the information, he hastened to Philadelphia with the view of a return to England. This caused delay of his receipt of my letter; which had not come to hand, when he left Baltimore.

In the conversations—for there were two—with Dr. Coke, in the presence of Dr. Magaw, there was certainly reference to the decease of Mr. Wesley, to what effect, I do not recollect, altho' I am persuaded it had no bearing on the purpose of the visits of Dr. Coke. That gentleman did not intimate any intention of withdrawing the proposals, contained in his letter; and I was left at full liberty to communicate to our convention.

I am respectfully, Rev'd. sir, your very humble servant

WM WHITE.

From Dr. Coke's letter to bishop White, I draw the following inferences.

1. That the doctor did not consult, either the travelling or local preachers of the church, or even Mr. Asbury, his colleague, before he proposed to be reunited with the Protestant Episcopal church; but of his own accord, offered to dispose of the Methodist episcopal church, with as little ceremony, as a Russian nobleman would offer to dispose of the peasantry upon his estate, as lord of the soil.

2. That as he made these proposals, without the knowledge of either ministers or members of the Methodist episcopal church, he may have disregarded the instructions he received from Mr. Wesley, by organizing the societies in America, into an independent Methodist episcopal church. If he thought it best to do the one, he may have thought it best to do the other. And if he acted secretly in the former instance, he may have acted so in the latter.

3. That Dr. Coke was not satisfied with what has been called his episcopal ordination; and that he did not believe he had been constituted a bishop, in the common acceptation of that term, when he was "set apart" by Mr. Wesley to the office of a superintendent.

4. That, with intention to be constituted a bishop, he applied to bishop White for consecration; and to induce the bishop the more readily to comply with his wishes, he proposed a re-union with the Protestant Episcopal church, which union, he thought, ought to be an object with that church.

5. That there was not a good understanding between Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury, such as ought to exist between two Christian superintendents belonging to the same church. That the former was jealous of the popularity or power of the latter; and with a view of lessening the one, or weakening the other, he proposed to be re-united to the Protestant Episcopal church. Could he effect this union, and obtain consecration in it as a bishop he knew with all bishop-admiring people, he would gain such an ascendancy over his rival, as he could not hope to obtain in any other way.

6. That Mr. Wesley had been made acquainted with every thing that had taken place in America; and that so far from expressing his approbation of the measures which had been adopted, he was "*sorry for the separation*," and for the steps he had taken, by which that "*separation*" had been facilitated.



SECTION VII.—*The Prayer Book of 1784.*

WHOEVER has read my "*History and Mystery*," will recollect, that in that work, I inserted a copy of the letter, which I addressed to each of the five bishops of the Methodist episcopal church, soliciting information from them, whether they had "*ever seen any document or letter written by Mr. Wesley, in which he explicitly recommended to the Methodist societies in America, the adoption of the episcopal mode of church government, according to the statements made in the minutes of conference for 1785.*" The same inquiry was made in the letter which I addressed to each of six of the oldest preachers in the connexion. In the same work, page 68, I say, "*there exists not in the range of our research, any paper, letter, or document to prove, that Mr. Wesley ever intended to constitute Dr. Coke or Mr. Asbury a bishop: or that he ever "recommended," or gave "counsel," that the societies should adopt the episcopal mode of church government, "in preference to any other."*" I say farther, on the same page, "*It may now be reasonably expected, that every member of the church will look for the establishment of the assertion, by clear and indubitable evidences, that Mr. Wesley "recommended" the episcopal mode of church government to the American Methodists.*"

Having made this demand for proof that Mr. Wesley did recommend the episcopal form of church government, it surely

might have been expected, that such proof would have been produced; or that a candid and honest acknowledgment, of the non-existence of such a document, would have been avowed. To any other man than Mr. E. there was no other course left; but his fertile imagination, hit upon an expedient, never, I presume, thought of, by any one before: such an expedient, that if *morals* were not too deeply involved, would produce a smile. In the preface to the prayer book, Mr. Wesley said, "this *edition* of it I recommend to the societies in America." Mr. E. finding the word *recommend* in it, seizes upon that term, as being likely to help his cause, and offers this, as Mr. Wesley's recommendation of the episcopal mode of church government. Hear what he says, "now does it comport with good sense to say, Mr Wesley recommended the *form* and not the *thing* which that form imports? And will any intelligent man pronounce, that that thing is not an *episcopal order* of ministers, and an *episcopacy* in *fact*, by whatever names they may have been called? This point is so plain, that we are really ashamed to dwell on it." Def. p. 40.

On this sentence, I shall remark. 1. I admire *modesty* in whomsoever it may be found; but feel no greater predilection for *mock modesty*, than I do for "voluntary humility." They are both equally repugnant to the genius of the Gospel, and are never assumed but for some secret, improper purpose or design. I regret, therefore, that in this instance, Mr. E's *bashfulness* became so excessive, as to have prevented him from dwelling a little longer on this point. The abrupt manner in which he dropped a subject so plain, is proof, that there was a more cogent reason than bashfulness, for not saying more on it than he has done; the reader, therefore, will consider what he says, as only a flourish, or an effort to get rid of a knotty and difficult matter. 2. I called for "clear and indubitable evidence," to support the assertion, that Mr Wesley recommended the episcopal form of church government, and lo! Mr. Wesley's recommendation of a prayer book is produced. 3. This has a strong resemblance of the confusion of tongues, which prevailed at the building of the tower of Babel. When one called for brick, another brought him mortar: "So did God confound their language, that they did not understand one another's speech." 4. It may, now, be taken for granted, that there never was any document, paper or letter in which Mr. Wesley recommended the episcopal mode of church government. Had there been such a document, Mr. E. would have produced it; and not have rested the assertion under consideration, on a kind of proof, which, if it were true, is only inferential. 5. Mr. E. has blended an "episcopal order of ministers," and "an episcopacy in fact," in the same sentence with what he calls Mr. Wesley's recommendation of an episcopal form of

government; it will be proper, therefore, in this section, to review the former as well as the latter. 6 He asserts that the "episcopal order of ministers" in the Methodist episcopal church, "is the same as exists in the church of England:" because the prayer book was abridged by Mr. Wesley, and because "our bishops are ordained with the same solemnities, and for the same purpose, viz. to preside over the flock of Christ, including the *presbyters* and *deacons*, and to ordain others." Def. p. 40. It is to be hoped, that after this, we shall hear no more of the futile distinction between "office" and "order;" and that we shall never be told again, the term "bishop," as used in the Methodist episcopal church, is only the name of an "office;" unless it can be made appear, that the term "bishop," in the church of England, is only the name of an "office," and does not, in that church, signify a distinct "*order*" from *presbyters*; a thing which Mr. E. cannot prove.

Having made these remarks, I return to the very pith of the controversy, namely, whether bishops in the Methodist episcopal church, are a third order of ministers, distinct from *presbyters* and superior to them, or whether they are of the same order. And here I think it proper to state explicitly, that "divine right" has nothing to do with the settling of this question; it enters not into the discussion at all. I make this declaration, that Mr. E. may not again attempt to evade the question, and slip off under the cover of "divine right." The inquiry regards the *parity* of bishops and *presbyters*; are they equal in order, or are they not? Upon this point, I am sorry to be obliged to say it. there is a great deal of shuffling prevarication, palpable contradiction, and gross deception among those who would uphold Methodist episcopacy. Some say that they believe there are but *two orders* of ministers in the church of Christ, *presbyters* and *deacons*: and yet they represent Methodist bishops, as bishops in the "common acceptation" of that term. Others say, that when Mr. Wesley ordained Dr. Coke, he ordained him to an "office" but this ordination did not constitute him of a different and distinct "order" from what he was before his ordination; that the "office," to which he was ordained, was that of a superintendent, and that superintendent and bishop are synonymous terms. Others say, that "bishops, elders, or *presbyters* in the apostolical writings, were one and the same order of men," and yet there was "a *third order* in the church, called evangelists," and that our bishops "*very much resemble*" those "*evangelists*." Others say, "our bishops" are "bishops *in fact*;" although passing originally under the less imposing name of superintendents; and "our episcopacy" is an "episcopacy *in fact*," by whatever name it may be called. And lest any mistake should occur, in apprehending their meaning, they tell us, Methodist bishops are such bishops as are in the

church of England; "they have been ordained in the same manner, with the same solemnities, and for the same purposes."

In proof, that bishops in the Methodist episcopal church, are the *same order* that bishops in the church of England are, the abridged prayer book is adduced; which, Mr. E. says, contains "the forms for ordaining, of superintendents, elders, and deacons, which forms are precisely similar to those used by the church of England, and by the Protestant Episcopal church in this country." Def. p. 38. That the argument, intended to be founded on the insertion of these "forms," in the abridged prayer book, may have all the force desired, the ministers of the Methodist episcopal church, ordained under these forms, must be respectively and precisely of the same order, as those in "the church of England, and the Protestant Episcopal church in this country," with which they are collated. Deacons in the Methodist episcopal church, must be contemplated of the same order as deacons in the "church of England," and in "the Protestant Episcopal church in this country." Methodist elders of the same order as Protestant presbyters. And Methodist superintendents of the same order as Protestant bishops. But is this the case? Does the church of England or any of her bishops, consider a Methodist superintendent of the same order as a bishop in that church? Does the "Protestant Episcopal church in this country," or any of its bishops, consider a Methodist superintendent of the same order as a bishop in that church? No: they do not. Why? Because bishops in these churches, are considered as a *third order* of ministers, distinct from and superior to presbyters. Did Mr. Wesley, by inserting the "form" for the ordination of a superintendent, intend thereby to make such superintendent, a minister of the *third order*? He did not. Why? Because he believed there are but *two orders*; "bishops and presbyters being of the *same order*." The argument intended to be drawn, in favor of Methodist episcopacy, from the "forms" being inserted in the prayer book, abridged by Mr. Wesley, is according to the judgment of "the church of England, the Protestant Episcopal church in this country," and Mr. Wesley himself, good for nothing, the assertion of Mr. E. to the contrary notwithstanding.

In order farther, to prove, that Mr Wesley recommended the episcopal mode of government, Mr. E. labours much to shew that by recommending the "liturgy," Mr. Wesley recommended the "forms and manner of ordaining superintendents, elders and deacons." But unfortunately for Mr. E. Mr. Wesley keeps apart, what Mr. E. would join together. In recommending the liturgy, he is very particular; whilst he is totally silent respecting these "forms." Mr. E. tells us, he takes the meaning of the terms "liturgy" and "common prayer," in a "comprehensive sense," as embracing the forms for ordaining superin-

tendents, &c. as well as the sunday service and psalms." But does Mr. Wesley tell us so, or does he take it in that sense? There is no evidence that he does. For, although he advises the use of the "liturgy on the Lord's day in all the congregations," he does not say one word about those "forms," nor about an episcopal form of government. That Mr. E. is "mistaken" in representing Mr. Wesley's recommendation of the "liturgy," as a recommendation of the episcopal mode of church government is very evident. And in proof of his mistake, I argue, that if the conference of 1784 had considered it in that light, they certainly would not have expunged from Mr. Wesley's letter of Sep. 10, 1784, that part of it, which according to Mr. E's argument, was the only plausible pretext for adopting the episcopal mode of government. But they did mutilate that letter, by expunging from the original, that part which relates to the "liturgy." I find a perfect copy of this letter, in the British minutes of conference for 1785; and the words which have been expunged, ought to follow the words "Lord's supper," in the 4th paragraph of the letter printed in the American minutes. The expunged words are these: "And I have prepared a *liturgy*, little differing from that of the church of England (I think the best constituted national church in the world) which I *advise* all the travelling preachers to use on the Lord's day, in all the congregations, reading the litany on Wednesdays and Fridays, and praying extempore on all other days."

Now, will Mr. E. Dr. Bond, or any one else, have the hardihood to say, that Mr. Wesley did not write this sentence? That it is not published in the British minutes for 1785, as a part of the original letter? Why then was it omitted in the American minutes? Why was this letter mutilated? Was it because it was supposed, that if published entire, it would militate against Methodist episcopacy? According to Mr. E's shewing, it would have operated wonderfully in its favor. What a pity that the whole conference was "*mistaken*." As for my part, I know not what they supposed, what they said, or what reason they assigned for leaving it out of their minutes; nor do I even know, when, or by whom it was done. But this one thing I know; that the suppression of the letter given to Dr. Coke, when he was "set apart as a superintendent," which letter, Mr. E. says, was a constituent part of the "sketch" prepared for the societies, by Mr. Wesley.—The mutilation of this letter, and the alteration of the minutes of conference; which alteration shall be abundantly established in the sequel, prove to my mind, that there has been great unfairness practiced, in the organization of the church; and that Methodist episcopacy was "surreptitiously" introduced. I want no stronger evidence of this fact, than these things furnish.

The recommendation of the prayer book, being the only evidence that Mr. E. has attempted to produce, in proof of the assertion, that Mr. Wesley recommended the episcopal mode of government, it will be sufficient to show, that when Mr. Wesley recommended the use of the "liturgy" or "common prayer," he did not recommend the episcopal form of church government. Mr. E. says he did, I assert he did not; and assign the following reasons.

1. Because such a recommendation would have been *deceptious*. There are now 400,000 members in the Methodist episcopal church, very few of whom ever heard of Mr. Wesley's prayer book until lately. Now, let any one, who never heard of such a prayer book, read what is said respecting Mr. Wesley's recommending the episcopal form of government, and what opinion would he form, from that statement? He certainly would conclude, that Mr. Wesley did recommend it to some person or other; that he did write some letter, or document, in which he praised such a form of government, and advised its adoption. This, I am confident, is the way in which the term "*recommend*" would be understood; and no man would think of looking for such a recommendation, in a prayer book of which he never heard, no more than he would think of looking for it, in an old Almanack.

2. Because such a recommendation would have been *novel*. If Mr. Wesley intended to recommend the episcopal form of government, when he only recommended the use of the "liturgy," or "common prayer," then he has departed from his usual way of expressing himself. A similar instance cannot be found, in all his voluminous writings, of his recommending one thing by *name*, when he intended to recommend another thing *not named*. Why then, should he be made to depart, in this single instance, from his usual method, and not from his only, but from the method of every correct writer, and every honest man? I challenge Mr. E. to produce from the British classics, such another instance of absurd recommendation, as he attributes to Mr. Wesley: nor can he find any writer on "ethics" or moral philosophy, who will justify such a procedure.

3. If Mr. Wesley recommended the episcopal form of government, then, according to Mr. E's. statement, he did it only *indirectly*; for he only recommended the "*form*" not the "*thing*;" the *shadow*; not the *substance*. With as much truth might Mr. E. say, Mr. Wesley recommended the episcopal form of government, when he recommended doctor Coke, as say, he recommended that form of government, when he recommended the use of the "liturgy."

4. Because no document, paper, or letter can be produced in proof that Mr. Wesley ever wrote the words, "episcopal form of government," with reference to the American Methodists.

There never was a document in which he recommended it; no, nor one in which, he ever expressed his approbation of it, after it had been adopted. Let the reader mark Mr. E's dissingenuousness on this point. He says Mr. Wesley wrote a certain letter, "and it does not contain one syllable of censure or disapprobation." Def. p. 72 In another place, he says, "Dr. Coke dedicated his Journals to Mr. Wesley, and where is the evidence, that he ever remonstrated against this, or expressed the slightest displeasure of it" Def. p. 59. And where, I say, "is the slightest evidence" that Mr. Wesley ever recommended this form of government, or expressed his approbation of it? There is not the slightest particle whatever. The proof of the recommendation lies on Mr. E. as the title to an estate is to be produced by the party claiming it.

5. If, by recommending the use of the "liturgy", Mr. Wesley recommended the episcopal form of government, then, according to Mr. E's reasoning, he recommended such a form of episcopal government as exists in the church of England; in which there are three separate and distinct orders of ministers, bishops, presbyters, and deacons. Had Mr. Wesley done this, he would have flatly contradicted what he himself said in his letter, drawn up the day *after* the date of his preface to the prayer book. "Lord King's account of the primitive church convinced me many years ago, that bishops and presbyters are the *same order*." If Mr. Wesley could have been so inconsistent, if he could thus have contradicted himself, one day asserting there were but *two orders*, and the next day affirming there were *three*, his authority, instead of being received, ought to have been totally rejected.

6 According to Mr. E's shewing, if Mr. Wesley recommended the episcopal form of government, he recommended such an episcopacy as exists in the church of England. In that case, he recommended diocesan episcopacy; for bishops in the church of England are diocesan bishops. This he substantially denies in a note inserted in the British minutes of conference for 1785. "If any one is minded to dispute concerning diocesan episcopacy, he may dispute. I have better work." A very appropriate answer to all that Mr. E. has said, or can say, respecting Mr. Wesley's silence, in not expressing his displeasure more fully, at the formation of the Methodist societies, into an independent episcopal church, and all their subsequent proceedings; he had "better work" to do, than be "disputing" with men who had violated his instructions; assumed a title, which, in the most solemn manner, he had forbidden them to assume; and had acted towards him in such a way, by leaving his name off their minutes, "that from the time he was informed of it, he began to hang down his head, and to think he had lived long enough."

7. If Methodist bishops are of the same order as bishops in the church of England, it was unnecessary for Dr. Coke to ap-

ply to the bishop of London in 1799, to ordain, only "a few" of the preachers, in the British connexion. What necessity was there to apply to his lordship to ordain only a few, if he himself was a bishop. The application stands as a clear proof, that notwithstanding all Mr. E. has said respecting Dr. Coke having "no doubt," "not the shadow of a doubt" of his being a bishop, the doctor himself knew better; he knew he was no bishop.

8. On the supposition, that by recommending the use of the "liturgy," Mr. Wesley recommended the episcopal form of government, to those societies to whom he sent the prayer book, then, he recommended the episcopal form of government to his societies in Scotland, for he sent the prayer book to them. In the British minutes of conference for 1786, Mr. Wesley says, "I at length consented to take the *same steps* with regard to Scotland, which I had done with regard to America." And Mr. Myles, in his History of the Methodists, tells us, "Mr. Wesley at the conference of 1785, set apart three of our well tried preachers, John Pawson, Thomas Hanby, and Joseph Taylor, to minister in Scotland. He also recommended to the Scotch Methodists the use of the *abridged common prayer*. This latter they declined; the former they were thankful for." p. 168. It may be asked, why was not the episcopal form of government adopted by the Scotch Methodists, as well as by the American Methodists? For, according to Mr. E's statement, it was recommended to both. Can it be resolved into their different views of church government, the former being presbyterians; the latter inclined to be episcopalians? Not so: for Dr. Coke tells the bishop of London in his letter to that nobleman, that "our numerous societies in America would have been a regular *presbyterian church*" if it had not been for himself and Mr. Wesley. The American Methodists therefore, were in favor of a presbyterian government, as well as the Scotch. Was it because the Scotch Methodists were more obstinate, and less disposed to comply with Mr. Wesley's *recommendation*, than the American Methodists? No. To what then can the difference between the Scotch and American societies be attributed? To the different views and dispositions of Mr. Wesley's delegates. The one class of delegates faithfully and punctiliously obeyed Mr. Wesley's directions. The other class violated his instructions, which were given in the most solemn and sacred manner. The Scotch Methodists, although they "declined the use of the prayer book, were thankful for the ordinances," and continued in connexion with Mr. Wesley, until the day of his death. The American Methodists used the prayer book for a little while, and then laid it aside. Moreover, they rejected Mr. Wesley's authority, struck his name off their minutes, and now pretend to offer his recommendation of this prayer book, which they

have long since thrown away, as a recommendation of their episcopal form of church government!!!

9. According to Mr. E's showing, Mr. Wesley recommended the episcopal form of government to his societies in England, as well as to those in Scotland and America. For the same recommendation, and the same forms of ordination, on which Mr. E. so confidently relies, to support the cause of Methodist episcopacy, are in the abridged prayer book which is used by the English Methodists to this day. And not only so, but Mr. Wesley, at the conference of 1787, "set apart Messrs. Alexander Mather, Thomas Rankin, and Henry Moore, without sending them out of England, strongly advising them at the same time, that according to his example, they should continue united to the established church, so far as the blessed work, in which they were engaged, would permit. The former of these brethren, Mr. Mather, he ordained a superintendent." Myles's *His. of the Methodists*, p. 175. If the Scotch Methodists refused to follow Mr. Wesley's "counsel" and adopt the episcopal form of government, because of their strong predilections in favor of presbyterianism, were the English Methodists influenced to the same amount, by those predilections also? Or, of all the societies to whom the prayer book was sent, did the American Methodists alone, understand the import of Mr. Wesley's recommendation, and cheerfully "follow his counsel," by adopting this mode of government? This, surely is incredible; for if his intentions had been misunderstood elsewhere; he was alive several years after he recommended the use of the "liturgy" to his societies in England, and could have corrected that mistake, if it had been one.

10. If Mr. Wesley recommended the episcopal mode of church government, "an episcopacy in fact," though under the name of a superintendent; and if he thought that the term *bishop* was innocently, and through inadvertence or mistake, adopted, instead of the original title *superintendent*, he would not, he could not have written his letter of severe reproof to Mr. Asbury for assuming the title *bishop*, without noticing the difference between the terms, and pointing out the impropriety of such a substitution. But Mr. Wesley was well convinced there was no mistake, or inadvertence in the assumption of the title of bishop. He knew it was taken in pointed opposition to his authority; and in direct violation of his solemn commands. He therefore wrote in a manner, and used such language, as he never did before or afterwards. His letter of reproof to Mr. Asbury, for assuming the title of bishop, must, therefore, remain for ever, an irrefragable proof, that he did not design an "episcopacy in fact," nor recommend the episcopal form of government.

11. The American preachers, in the conference of 1784, did not consider the recommendation of the use of the liturgy or common prayer, a recommendation of the episcopal form of government. If they had, they surely would have said so, and have set forth this recommendation as the reason for their adopting this form. But instead thereof, they assign other reasons for their conduct, and never as much as glance at Mr. Wesley's recommendation of the liturgy. This is an omission which they would not have committed, had they considered his recommendation of the use of the liturgy, a recommendation of the episcopal form of government. Having assigned their reasons, they say "*For these reasons* we have thought it our duty to form ourselves into an independent church. And as the most excellent mode of church government, *according to our maturest judgment* is that of a *moderate episcopacy*; we therefore have constituted ourselves into an episcopal church." Not a word about Mr. Wesley's recommendation here.

12. The statement which is published in the book of discipline, ch. I, sect. I, was not published until *after* the death of Mr. Wesley, which event took place, nearly seven years *after* the organization of the church. Prior to his death, this section had not been written. If Mr. Wesley recommended this form of government, how came his recommendation to be overlooked or forgotten so long? Or how did it happen, that it was not published at an earlier period? Was it for fear that if published in his life time, he would contradict it? Whatever may have been the reason, we are certain of this fact, that this account was not written, until *after the death of Mr. Wesley*, as is evident from the manner in which it speaks of him as "*the late Rev. John Wesley*." Ah! this little monosyllable "*late*" has blown up the whole affair and has proven, not only, that this first section, in the discipline, was by some one or other foisted into it, but that it was done with a view to impose the episcopal form of government, on the societies, under the sanction of Mr. Wesley's name. It is in this way, by little and little, and by setting up one prop after another, that Methodist episcopacy has been established: and in the certain admeasurement of retributive justice, it is by publishing one document after another, and by developing one fact after another, that Methodist episcopacy is destined to come down.

These are some of the reasons, which have induced me to believe, that Mr. Wesley never intended, by recommending the use of the liturgy, to recommend the episcopal form of government; and when Mr. E. has answered these, I promise him I will furnish him with a few others. However, to confirm what I have said, respecting the preachers who composed the conference of 1784, not understanding or believing, that the recommendation of the prayer book was a recommendation of the episcopal

form of church government, I shall subjoin the testimony of a few of those, who were members of that conference and who have survived their fellow labourers of that day.

Extract of a letter from Rev. Edward Dromgoole, dated
"Brunswick 26 Sept 1828."

"I do not recollect that there was any proposition for our receiving the prayer book and episcopacy connected. And it is certain, the preachers never considered themselves obliged to conform to the prayer book, for they did not make use of it on Wednesdays and Fridays *as recommended*."

Yours very sincerely

EDWARD DROMGOOLE, sen.

Extract of a letter from Rev. Thomas Ware, dated
"Salem 1 Dec. 1828."

"Mr. Emory's Defence of our Fathers, I have seen, and once read; but I have it not; and but an imperfect recollection of his argument founded on Mr. Wesley's recommendation of the liturgy. I am fully persuaded the preachers in 1784 believed they were acting in accordance with the will of Mr Wesley, when they adopted the episcopal form or *the plan of general superintendency*. This plan we know Mr. Wesley approved, and we called it episcopal. I did not believe Mr. Wesley wished us to give it that appellation. Dr. Coke was in favour of taking the name of Methodist episcopal church: argued the plan of general superintendency was in fact a species of episcopacy, but did not, I think, bring the prayer book into view.

THOMAS WARE."

The following is from Rev. Jonathan Forrest.

"As for what Mr. Emory has said in the Defence of our Fathers respecting the recommendation of the prayer book abridged by Mr. Wesley, being a recommendation of the episcopal form of church government for the American Methodist societies, I did not consider it in that light at the conference of 1784. Nor have I considered it in that light, at any time since. Nor do I consider it in that light now. Nor do I believe it was so considered by any person in the conference of 1784.

JONATHAN FORREST."



SECTION VIII.—*The Prayer Book of 1786.*

WHEN I was informed that Mr. E. was about to reply to my "History and Mystery," I fully expected he would attempt, in some way, to avoid an admission of Dr. Coke's agency in the publication of this prayer book. But, as he has admitted this fact, I think it unnecessary to swell this section by arguments or documents to prove it. I shall, therefore, proceed to offer

what I have to say respecting this prayer book, under three heads : The doctor's agency in having it printed—the probability that Mr. Wesley saw the minutes of conference of 1784, which are re-printed with it—and Mr. Wesley's silence with respect to any expression of his disapprobation of the title the "Methodist episcopal church."

First. As to Dr. Coke's agency in the publication of the prayer book. The attention of the reader is solicited to the following facts. 1. In the year 1784 Mr. Wesley abridged the prayer book of the church of England, and recommended the use of it to the American Methodists : but in all the book, there is not one word about bishops, or episcopacy, or about an episcopal form of government. 2. He had this abridged prayer book printed at his own printing press, just before Dr. Coke sailed for America. 3. This prayer book was not even bound in England ; for, as Mr. E. says, "the prayer book of 1784 was brought to America *in sheets*." 4. The minutes of the general conference of 1784, "were first printed in Philadelphia by Charles Cist, and were bound up with the prayer book which was brought from England in 1784." 5. Dr. Coke sailed from America to England in June 1785, less than six months after the church was organized, leaving a supply of the prayer book, in which the minutes were bound up, behind him, for the American societies. Now, putting all these facts together, every one will inquire, why had Dr. Coke this prayer book re-printed so soon after his arrival in England ? And why had he it done at the press of "Frys and Couchman," and not at Mr. Wesley's ? It is reasonable to suppose, 1. that when Mr. Wesley had the prayer book printed, he had a sufficient number struck off, to serve his societies. 2. The short time which had elapsed, between the doctor's leaving the United States, and commencing printing it in England, was not sufficient for distributing among the societies, the prayer book which he had left behind in this country ; or for ascertaining whether there was a sufficient supply for the societies or not. 3. Even if it had been ascertained that there was not a sufficient supply, the prayer book and minutes were both in this country, and could have been re-printed as well, and as cheap here, as they could have been done in England. This may be inferred from the prayer book being brought over "in sheets," to be bound in America. Had the prayer book and minutes been re-printed here, there would then have been a saving of freight, risk &c.: besides having them ready for distribution at a much earlier period, than they could have been, if obtained from England. If a farther supply was really necessary, every thing was in favor of having them re-printed in this country ; and to men of common sense, the matter will appear mysterious, and unaccountable, if there were no particular and private ends to answer, why they were re-printed in London,

a few months after the doctor's return to England, and not in the United States.

Second. But why was the prayer book and minutes re-printed at the press of Frys and Couchman, and not at Mr. Wesley's? I answer, because the proceedings of the American conference, in the assumption of the title "Methodist episcopal church" &c. were displeasing to Mr. Wesley. I have "candidly considered" what Mr. E. says respecting the *probability* that Mr. Wesley saw the minutes of conference, and cannot conceive any other reason why the work was done at the press of Frys and Couchman. Out of the *nine questions* which Mr. E. has proposed to the consideration of his readers, six of them are ushered in with a "probable," or a "presumable;" two are accompanied with an "if;" and one is set down as being "certain." I admit it to be a "certain" fact, that "Mr. Wesley felt a sufficient interest in this matter to have required from Dr. Coke a particular account of what had been done in America" Def. p. 43. It is therefore certain, that Mr. Wesley saw those minutes or he did not. If he did not see them, it is evident that the doctor was conscious of having exceeded Mr. Wesley's instructions, and having done that, which he was sensible would be displeasing to Mr. Wesley, when known. The only way then, of keeping those minutes from falling under Mr. Wesley's notice, and yet to have the book printed, was to have it done at some other press. If, upon the other hand, Mr. Wesley did see them, it is *very* evident that he disapproved of the doctor's conduct, and would not allow the prayer book and minutes to be printed at his press. But "where is the evidence," says Mr. E. that Mr. Wesley "ever objected to the title, or to the terms episcopal, or episcopacy?" Where! Why, in the very circumstance of this prayer book, and these minutes being re-printed, not at his own press, but at the press of Frys and Couchman. Had the doctor informed Mr. Wesley that he had received advices from America, that there was not a sufficient supply of the prayer book, for the wants of the societies; and had he intimated that it would be necessary, to have another edition printed, can any one suppose that Mr. Wesley would not have had it done? that he would have objected against the printing of it at his own press? or allow, nay compel the doctor to go to Frys and Couchman to have the work executed there? And moreover, make the doctor pay for the edition out of his own private fortune? Incredible! Mr. Wesley would never have acted in this manner, had he approved of the doctor's doings; he had very different ideas of generosity and justice.

Considering this transaction then, in all its parts, it is impossible to reconcile the printing of the prayer book and minutes at the press of Frys and Couchman with Mr. Wesley's approbation of the doctor's proceedings. Indeed to suppose that he gave his consent, to have them printed at any other press than

his own, would be incompatible with the interest he had heretofore manifested towards the American societies. It would have been in direct opposition to his usual custom. For, as the profits of all the books printed at his press, were applied according to his views, to the carrying on of the blessed work in which he was engaged, it is not reasonable, that in this solitary instance, he would have relinquished his right of disposing of the proceeds of this edition of his prayer book, any more than he would of those of any other of his works. Or if he intended, gratuitously to tender the edition to the American societies, he would not have thrown the payment of printing it upon Dr. Coke. He must have been aware also, that by refusing to have the prayer book and minutes printed at his own press, he would afford ground to impugn Dr. Coke's motives and conduct, in the organization of the Methodist episcopal church, as contravening his own wishes and instructions, and yet, that consideration could not prevail on him to do a thing, that might be construed to imply an approval of the proceedings of the doctor and the American conference. In fine; for Dr. Coke to have this prayer book and these minutes re-printed in London—in a few months after his return from the United States—before it could have been ascertained that a second edition was necessary—at the press of Frys and Couchman—and not at Mr. Wesley's—and all out of his own private "fortune," must be proof positive and irresistible, to every impartial mind, that there was an object of a peculiar character to be obtained; that the obtainment of it could only be effected, by the prayer book and minutes coming from England, and that that object was the apparent sanction of Mr. Wesley, to the whole of the proceedings of the conference of 1784.

Third. "Assuming as a fact," says Mr. E. "that Mr. Wesley did become acquainted with the acts and proceedings of Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury, and the conference of 1784, in the organization of the Methodist episcopal church, we ask, where is the evidence that he ever disavowed them?" Def. p. 45. And is this the proper question to ask? Mr. E. knows it is not; and if he attempt to deny it, his own pen shall contradict him. Although he knows it is not a proper question; such a one as a lawyer, a doctor of divinity, a Christian, a man of common sense, or a candid deist, would ask if he wished to arrive at the *truth*, yet Mr. E. artfully and shamelessly fills half a page of his book in asking such questions; until at last, having warmed himself at a fire of his own kindling, he concludes in a sort of triumph, by saying, "We deny that one syllable of such evidence has ever yet been produced." And suppose no such evidence has ever been "produced," will it follow that no such evidence is in existence, or that Mr. Wesley never "disavowed" those proceedings? Mr. E. ought to have recollected, that six years ago, he might have said, with as much exultation,

respecting the term "bishop," what he now says respecting "episcopacy," and the title "Methodist episcopal church." But the publication of Mr Wesley's letter to Mr. Asbury, in which he says, "Men may call me a *knave*, or a *fool*, a *rascal*, a *scoundrel* and I am content; but they shall never by my consent, call me a bishop," has robbed Mr. E. of this boasting, and stands as evidence, that Mr. Wesley strongly disapproved of the title of "bishop." This letter was kept secret for nearly forty years; notwithstanding Coke and Moore wrote a life of Mr Wesley, shortly after his decease. Additional evidence therefore, of Mr. Wesley's disavowal of "episcopacy," of the episcopal form of church government, and of the proceedings of the conference of 1784, may be in existence, although not "produced." For, how could it be expected, that the very men who were censured by Mr. Wesley, would publish the documents condemning themselves and their proceedings? But if all the papers are yet in existence which relate to the organization of the Methodist episcopal church, &c. and if these papers were accessible to other people, besides the men into whose hands they have fallen, I strongly suspect, and I have reasons for thinking so which Mr. E. knows nothing of, that the boasting of the author of the "Defence of our Fathers" would be temporary and vain.

To the most superficial reader it is plain, that it is not by the *absence* of evidence, of the disavowal "of the proceedings of Dr. Coke, Mr. Asbury and the conference of 1784," that Mr. Wesley's approbation of those proceedings, and his recognition of the title "Methodist episcopal church," are to be proved. As well might A say that his title to an estate was valid, because B could not produce a title to the same estate. And yet it is in this way—a way which shocks common sense, and it might be added, common honesty, that Mr. E. strives to support the claims of Methodist episcopacy. If these claims are just and well founded, let it be shown by *positive* proof. If Mr. Wesley did, indeed, approve of "the proceedings of Dr. Coke, Mr. Asbury, and the conference of 1784," let the evidence of it be produced. If Methodist episcopacy had Mr. Wesley's approbation, it will be strange, if nothing of this approbation can be found, among all Mr. Wesley's, Dr. Coke's, or Mr. Asbury's papers. To produce *documentary* and *explicit* evidence of this fact I challenge the world. If such evidence is among Mr. Wesley's papers, Mr. Moore can produce it. If such evidence is among Dr. Coke's papers, Mr. Drew can produce it. And if such evidence is among Mr. Asbury's papers, Mr. McKendree can produce it. Mr. E. has called for help from brethren in Europe as well as in America, let us see if the above gentlemen, who are all alive, will be able to furnish the documents now called for. "The burden of proof in this matter is not proper-

ly incumbent on us," Def. p. 36, but on Mr. E. If he does not produce it, his shuffling attempts to defend Methodist episcopacy in this negative sort of way, will stand in proof. that neither this "episcopacy nor this episcopal form of government" had Mr. Wesley's approbation.

The strong manner in which I have expressed myself in the call for "*documentary and explicit evidence*" that Mr. Wesley approved of the proceedings of Dr. Coke, Mr. Asbury and the conference of 1784, may, perhaps to some, be exceptionable: but I consider the subject, and the circumstances under which I write, not only justify, but imperiously demand it. Nor would I venture to express myself in this manner were it not, that I am very confident no such evidence can be produced. There is now lying before me a letter from a preacher who was a member of the conference of '84, which contains the following sentence: "Dr. Coke, in 1787, made us a second visit, and brought instructions with him from Mr. Wesley, which instructions I never saw, or heard but in part. I received a letter from a preacher who had seen them, and quoted from them the following words: Put as few things as possible to vote. If you (Dr. Coke) brother Asbury and brother Whatcoat are agreed, it is sufficient." Mr. Wesley gave these directions, because he disapproved of the proceedings of the conference of 1784. Will Mr. E. say, he objects to "this third hand report?" He can receive the same information from Rev. Nelson Reed who related to myself, Mr. Wesley's objection to putting things to vote.

There are two or three other things, which I shall briefly notice, before I proceed to the next section. "Mr. M-Caine has represented, that Mr. Wesley did punish Dr. Coke for his proceedings at this period, by leaving his name off the minutes for one year. *But this is an entire mistake.*" Def. 43. My words are, "Under these circumstances, as some decisive steps were necessary to be taken in this critical affair, it was finally determined, that the name of Dr. Coke should be omitted in the minutes for the *succeeding year*: it was accordingly omitted." His. and Mys. p. 46. I gave this as a quotation from Drew's life of Dr. Coke. Let us now see, how Mr. E. proves this to be a "*mistake.*" "Under these circumstances, as some decisive steps were necessary to be taken in this critical affair, it was finally determined, that the name of Dr. Coke should be omitted in the minutes for the *succeeding year.*" Def. p. 61. The very words I had quoted, and which, he says, was an *entire mistake!* And is this the way Mr. E. proves my mistake? But this is only one of Mr. E's little tricks; there is another skulking in the next two lines. "At this very conference of 1785, Dr. Coke's name appears in the British Minutes, after John and Charles Wesley themselves." And what if it does? Does that prove

the "mistake?" Really I always thought, that the "succeeding year" after 1785 was 1786. The very year I said Dr. Coke's name was left off the British minutes. And if Mr. E. can find the doctor's name in the minutes of 1786, I will acknowledge I have made a mistake indeed.

Mr. E says, "in 1787 and 1788 he (Dr. Coke) was again stationed in London with John and Charles Wesley." And he intimates in the same paragraph that I asserted that the doctor's name was left off in 1789. Now in this short paragraph consisting of seven lines only, there are three capital blunders, or misrepresentations. For Charles Wesley died March 29th, 1788, and yet Mr. E. stations Dr. Coke with him in London after he was *dead*!! And, as if that was not enough, he stations the doctor with him again in London in 1790, two years and four months after Mr. Wesley's decease. Nor is this all. Mr. E. might have seen, if he had looked carefully into the matter, that Dr. Coke sailed for America in October 1790, and did not return to England until after the death of Mr. John Wesley. So that while Dr. Coke was in America, and Charles Wesley was upwards of two years in heaven, Mr. E. will have them both stationed together in London. But the worst of all is, that in the "Christian Advocate and Journal for June 3, 1828," Mr. E. strives to make his readers believe that these "errors" were not in the "original manuscript" "How the name of Charles Wesley, says he, came to be inserted in this place, I am not able to say. I think it could not have been so in the original manuscript; because, in writing this passage, the minutes of the British conference were open before me." I believe it is susceptible of proof, that Mr. E. knew nothing of these "errors" until they were mentioned to him by the Hon. Judge—That when informed of them, he expressed surprise, and said, "it cannot be, for I had the British minutes before me, when I wrote the account. It must be a typographical error;" and so confident was he that the "original manuscript" was correct, that he would not believe to the contrary, until he went to the house of a gentleman in Baltimore and examined those minutes. And now, forsooth, he wants to throw the blame upon the poor printer, and to metamorphose him into a scape-goat. No, no, the printer is innocent of the charge. It serves, however, as another proof of Mr. E's disingenuousness, and of his willingness to throw the blame upon any one, rather than admit that he can be "mistaken."



SECTION IX.—*Bishop Asbury.*

ALTHOUGH the name of Bishop Asbury stands at the head of this section, very little is said respecting him, on the two or three first pages of Mr. E's book: Mr. Wesley being brought

forward as the principal personage. Nor, is the manner in which Mr. Wesley's name is mentioned, free from all exception; for it would seem as if Mr. E. intended, by inserting the name of Mr. Wesley, connected with all his implied frailties and imperfections, to set off, by contrast, the splendid virtues of Mr. Asbury. This surely, is not right. We ought to do them both justice, for they are both entitled to our "reverence unfeigned and profound." "We have never felt free, however, (says Mr. E.) to claim for him (Mr. Wesley) absolute infallibility." And who ever did? Mr. Wesley never claimed it for himself; nor would he allow any to claim it for him, or attribute it to him, if they were inclined to do so. Indeed, were it necessary to institute a comparison between Mr. Asbury and Mr. Wesley on this point, there certainly would be much stronger evidence in proof that Mr. Asbury was nearer claiming "infallibility" for himself, by asserting "*divine authority*" for his episcopal power, than ever Mr. Wesley was. But waiving all this, from the insidious manner in which Mr. E. expresses himself, it must be evident, that his profession of "reverence for the name and character of Mr. Wesley" is hollow and insincere, and that his remark, respecting his "absolute infallibility," is not only uncalled for, but invidious.*

* In the "Christian Advocate and Journal," of February 8th. 1828, there is a letter from Mr. E. to the editors, in which he states "some facts" which he says "may be worth preserving." They are these: "When Dr. White was in England in 1787, he was desirous of seeing Mr. Wesley, to state to him some circumstances, of which he supposed he might be uninformed, in reference to the organization of the Methodist societies in America as a distinct church." With this view he called at Mr. Wesley's house, and left a letter which he had obtained from Mr. Pilmore. Sometime after this, Dr. White addressed a note to Mr. Wesley, informing him "that he would stop at his house on a certain day, if convenient to him." Mr. Wesley answered that he was then engaged in a periodical duty "which would prevent him from receiving the visit at the time mentioned;" "but that in case of Dr. White's stay of a week or two, he would derive pleasure from the interview proposed." These are the "facts;" now for the inferences.

Mr. E. "*thinks*" that Dr. White's "*conjecture*," is "*highly probable*," that Mr. Wesley *supposed*, that Dr. White *wished* "to *impugn* the measure which Mr. Wesley had adopted with respect to the Methodists in America, and which he *did not intend to relinquish*." Mr. E. farther thinks, "that a man of Mr. Wesley's distinction and politeness should have evinced so little disposition to have an interview with Dr. White, is one of the strongest facts which we can well imagine, in proof of the fixedness of his views, in relation to the measures which he had adopted, for the distinct organization of the Methodist episcopal church in America;" and of his being perfectly satisfied with the title, "the Methodist Episcopal Church." Mr. E. also thinks it remarkable, that so *polite* a man as Mr. Wesley was, should *decline* an interview with Dr. White, and can in no way account for it, but on the supposition above stated. If his supposition or conjecture "furnish one of the *strongest facts* that can be well imagined in proof," of Mr. Wesley's approbation of the proceedings of the conference, in adopting the episcopal form of government. that proof is weak indeed, and "unentitled to one particle of credit." The reader has Mr. E's explanation of Dr. White's proposed interview with Mr. Wesley, and the reasons which influenced Mr. Wesley

That I may not be the mere copyist of Mr. E's omissions or mistakes, I shall take a brief view of Mr. Asbury's early, ministerial life—his sentiments with regard to ecclesiastical government—and the probable influence these sentiments had upon the introduction, and establishment of the government of the Methodist episcopal church.

In his "Journals," Mr. Asbury tells us that his "parents were people in common life," his father "being employed as a farmer and gardener by the two richest families in the parish"—that he "was sent to school early, and began to read the Bible between six and seven years of age"—that in consequence of the ill usage he received from his schoolmaster, he did not remain long at school—that "when he was about thirteen years and a half old, he made choice of a branch of business, at which he wrought about six years and a half" That he was "awakened before he was fourteen years of age,"—that when he "was between twenty-one and twenty-two, he gave himself up to God and his work, after acting as a local preacher near the space of five years." Journals, vol. 2, p. 133 et seq. "In the month of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and seventy-one, he tells us, he embarked in England for America." He was then 26 years old; and from his arrival in this country, until the church was organized, was 13 years.

When Mr. Asbury arrived in America, there were but few preachers, or members in society; for it appears by the book of minutes, that when the first conference was held in 1773, two years after his arrival, there were only 10 preachers, and 1160 members. From the commencement of his labours, his influence must have been great; and no circumstance was better calculated to increase it and fix it permanently, than his remaining in this country, through the whole of the revolutionary war, after his colleagues and countrymen had returned to England.

I am next to consider his sentiments with respect to church government. And these were decidedly and invariably in favor of episcopacy. Nor do I mean by that term such a non-descript "thing," as Mr. E. calls episcopacy; but really and truly such an episcopacy, and such an episcopal form of government as

to decline accepting the visit. Now let us have Mr. Wesley's account. He says, the reason of his not receiving Dr. White's visit at the time proposed, was, "that he was then engaged in a periodical duty of an examination of his society." Mr. E. says, the reason was, "that Mr. Wesley had not the smallest disposition, in any way, to depart from what he had done. or *hear it impugned*." Mr. Wesley says "in case of Dr. White's stay of a week or two, he would derive *pleasure* from the interview proposed." Mr. E. intimates that Mr. Wesley did not wish to receive the visit at all, and purposefully avoided it, lest he should have the *pain* of hearing "the measures which he had adopted *impugned*!!" I always knew, that Mr. Wesley was a *polite* man, but I never knew that he was a *liar*.

there is in the church of England in which are *three orders* of ministers, bishops, priests, and deacons. Any thing short of this, fell short of his views of episcopacy, and of an episcopal form of government.

In proof of this statement, it must be noticed, 1. That Mr. Asbury was educated and brought up in the church of England; and it is very reasonable to suppose, that, unless like Mr. Wesley, he had been convinced to the contrary, he would retain the doctrines of the church in which he had been brought up, and which admitted the *three orders*.

2 Mr. Drew, in his account of the schism which took place among the preachers in 1778 respecting the ordinances, and the part Mr. Asbury acted on that occasion, says, "Mr Asbury on hearing their statement and request, found himself in an unpleasant situation. *From principle* he was strongly attached to the episcopacy which had been abolished." Drew's life of Dr. Coke, p. 60. And on the next page he says, "Mr. Asbury, in the meanwhile, who had not yet shaken off the rusty fetters of *Apostolical succession*, found himself comparatively deserted by those whose respect for him still remained undiminished."

3. Dr. Coke and Mr. Moore, in their life of Mr. Wesley, express themselves pretty much in the same language "Mr Asbury's attachment to the *church of England*, was at that time (the time of the schism) *exceedingly strong*." p 350.

4. Mr. Asbury himself, has expressly stated his preference for episcopacy. It is not necessary to transcribe all the parts, which can be found in his Journals, where there is any allusion to this preference. The following extract is in point; and the work to which he alludes, is the work of one, whom Mr. E. has denounced as being a *high churchman*. "I read, and *transcribed* some of Potter's church government; and must *prefer* the episcopal mode of church government to the Presbyterian" Vol. I. p. 285. And on the next page he says, "I read and *transcribed* some of Potter's church government till ten o'clock." From the circumstance of his transcribing parts of this work, I would infer that archbishop Potter was a favourite author with Mr. Asbury; and yet no writer more strenuously defends "apostolical succession," the "divine right" of the priesthood, and the *third order* of ministers than archbishop Potter does.

5. The following extract is from a letter written by Mr. Asbury, dated Dec 26th, 1806.

"If our title had not been the Methodist *episcopal church*, and if the English translation had not rendered the *episcopoi*, bishops in the epistles of Paul to Timothy and Titus, well contented am I to be called superintendent, not bishop! I was elected and ordained a superintendent, as my parchments will prove. Does the scripture say the elder shall be the husband of one wife; by some men's rule of reasoning, we might prove, because it is not

expressly said of an elder, as a deacon and bishop in scripture, he shall be a husband of one wife, elders shall not marry, because we have no express scripture; but they say, *we are the same order*, then why not the same name in Greek and English? Why not deacons and bishops of the same order? This all churches agree in, *they are not*. It is an easy matter for our brethren, members and ministers that move in narrow circles to talk to little purpose”*

My third inquiry is, had these sentiments any influence, in introducing and establishing the episcopal form of government, when the church was organized? It is very probable they had. 1. Because Mr Asbury was fond of power; and it is reasonable to suppose that he wished the adoption of that form of government, which was most likely to secure to himself, the power, he at that time, possessed. Mr. E. does not claim for Mr. Wesley “absolute infallibility;” and it is presumable, he will not claim for Mr. Asbury absolute “*perfection*” or an entire exemption from the lot of the whole human family. As a man, therefore, he must have been under the influence of some ruling passion, of some predominant principle; and who that ever *knew* Mr. As-

* “As to the charge of our having at any time considered our bishops as a distinct ministerial order, contradistinguished from and superior to presbyters, it has no foundation in fact. The very circumstance of our having acknowledged the right of elders to ordain, is a sufficient refutation of the allegation. We consider the episcopacy a superior office in the church, not a distinct ministerial order; and this is the light in which it has been considered ever since the institution.” Narrative and Defence, p. 66. Will Mr. George Earnest & Co. persist in their assertion, after they have read the above extract from Mr. Asbury’s letter? Will they still insist on the correctness of their position, notwithstanding Mr. Morrell, Mr. Bangs and Mr. Emory have said there are “three orders?” Mr. Earnest & Co. ought to have had more *prudence* than to have published their opinion; and more caution than to set their names to a book, they did not write, and which some of them, perhaps, could not even read. Daniel ch. V. 8 v. They make a fine figure, to be sure, with their little scraps of French, and Latin, and Greek; and having ornamented their pages with these pretty little things, they thought they might tell the world, that I “*had been raised to distinction by the connexion.*” If, by the phrase “*raised to distinction,*” Mr. Earnest means, that I was awakened and converted by the instrumentality of the preachers of the Methodist episcopal church, he must allow me to tell him, he is mistaken. If, by that phrase, he means, I was a semi-mendicant, before I became a travelling preacher, and that the “*connexion*” took me off the dunghill; he must permit me to tell him, that when I entered into the travelling connexion, I relinquished a salary of seven hundred dollars a year, although I knew at the time I did it. I could only receive sixty-four dollars a year as a travelling preacher. Or, if, by being “*raised to distinction*” Mr. Earnest means *literary* “*distinction,*” and that I am indebted to the “*connexion*” for what little learning I have, he compels me to tell him, I was receiving a classical education when he was hammering his heel-taps upon a lapstone. The fact is, I have done more for the connexion than the connexion has done for me. And now, before we part, I will take the liberty to give Mr. Earnest a word of advice. Let book making and book *signing* alone hereafter; for you may depend upon it, you know nothing of church history, or about “*ministerial orders.*”

bury, does not know, that that passion was the love of power. He had been the principal personage, in the connexion so long; he had exercised the authority of "general assistant" for so many years, that when the church was about to be organized, he could not think of adopting any form of government, which would have any tendency to abridge his prerogatives, or distribute his power among his brethren. As he had been chief, he must be chief still. It was this love of power that led him to *prefer* episcopacy to presbyterianism. It was this principle which made him oppose Mr. Wesley's authority and violate Mr. Wesley's instructions. This principle dictated the letter mentioned by Mr. Brackenbury to Dr. Coke at Leeds, in which he declared "he would not receive any person deputed by Mr. Wesley to take any part of the superintendency invested in him." To the same principle may be ascribed his language to Mr. George Shadford, respecting Mr. Wesley: "Mr. Wesley and I are like Cæsar and Pompey, he will bear no equal and I will bear no superior." It was this principle which opposed the call of a general conference of the travelling preachers, and preferred a "council" composed of only nine presiding elders, who were all appointed by himself: wisely judging, the narrower the circle, the easier it would be to cover it; and the smaller the numerical resistance, the easier it would be to overcome it. It was this principle which led him to exercise a *negative* upon the proceedings of even this small number which composed the "council," and when urged to give it up, resisted and said, "*my negative is my own.*" It was this principle that opposed the appeal of Mr. O'Kelly, at the general conference of 1792; by the rejection of which he retained in his own hands, the sole power of stationing the preachers without an appeal. It was this principle which gave birth and growth to the contentions between Dr. Coke and himself.* It was this principle which planned a delegated general conference; and this principle ceased not to influence him as long as he lived. Taking into view, then, the whole of Mr. Asbury's conduct, both before and after the general conference of 1784, it cannot be supposed, that this "master passion," this predominant principle would be mute or inoperative at the organization of the church; especially considering the ascendancy he had obtained over both preachers and people and his exceedingly strong attachment to the church of England, and to the episcopal form of government. 2. It has already been shewn, that, "*from principle*" Mr. Asbury "was strongly attached to

* Notwithstanding all Mr. E. has said respecting the good understanding, the harmony, the union, the affection &c subsisting between Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury; the contrary *I know* to be the fact. Several letters, from these gentlemen, in proof of this statement, are now in my possession. These letters I decline publishing at present, but shall do it hereafter, if I am compelled to it.

episcopacy". That "his attachment to the church of England was *exceedingly strong*." That he "preferred the episcopal mode of church government to the presbyterian." And that he maintained the doctrine of *three orders*, bishops, presbyters, and deacons. To be consistent with himself, he must have wished, when the church was about to be organized, to have such a form of government as corresponded with his views. It is reasonable, therefore, to suppose, that he exerted all his influence with the preachers, to obtain for her the episcopal form, which he thought was the best, and which he *preferred* to all others. As he acted "*from principle*" and according to the best of his knowledge, the *honest* reader will readily understand, "what ideas I attach to the terms *wise* and *good*." I will not deny however, that men who are of a different character, or who do not act "from principle" may be utterly at a loss to comprehend me; nor would I be able to make the blind see, although I might spend hours, in the fruitless attempt.

How far Mr Wesley's conduct may have served, as a justification to Mr. Asbury, to strive to have the episcopal form of government adopted, I will not undertake to say. I readily admit, that the bare circumstance of the "setting apart Dr. Coke" to the office of "a superintendent," by the imposition of hands, simply and abstractedly considered, might have led Mr. Asbury to suppose, that Mr. Wesley did intend the episcopal form of government; especially, when we consider, how strongly Mr. Asbury was prejudiced in favor of that kind of government, where the *three orders* are recognized. Upon the other hand, I do not see how it was possible for him to understand Mr. Wesley to have recommended such a form of government, because Mr. Wesley's *circular* letter was before his eyes. In that letter Mr. Wesley expressly declares his conviction, that there are but *two orders*, presbyters and deacons; bishops and presbyters being the same. The probability of Mr. Asbury's understanding Mr. Wesley to have recommended the episcopal form of government, is farther diminished by another fact, namely, that Mr. Wesley severely reproved him for assuming the title of bishop, which title was exceedingly offensive to Mr. Wesley. Had Mr. Asbury really misunderstood Mr. Wesley's intentions, and had not the title of bishop been an object of primary consideration with him, an object upon which his very heart and soul were fixed, it cannot be conceived how he could have pursued it with so much perseverance, and clung to it with so much tenacity; that he would rather forfeit the esteem of "*one of his greatest friends*" than part with it. But the following facts put this matter beyond all doubt, and incontestibly prove, that *Mr. Wesley was not misunderstood*. Dr. Coke's letter of appointment, which "was part of the sketch," was *suppressed*. The circular letter of Sept. 10. 1784, was *mutilated*. Mr. Wesley's name was *struck off the minutes* in two

years after the church was organized, and the title "bishop" was assumed. The minutes of conference were *subsequently altered*, so that Mr. Wesley's name, which stood on the original minutes for '85 and '86, does not appear on the *printed* minutes from 1784 till 1789. No notice is taken of Mr. Wesley's death, altho' obituary notices are taken of all who died the same year, one of whom had not been more than "*two years and a half*" in the field of labour. Mr. Asbury makes no mention of Mr. Wesley's name, when enumerating the sources whence he derived his "episcopal authority." And lastly, the different and contradictory reasons assigned for the adoption of the episcopal mode of church government. ALL THESE ARE FACTS, the knowledge of which may be obtained by recurring to the various editions of the book of discipline, and to the minutes of conference. Whether those who were concerned in these matters were "good" or bad, "wise" or foolish for the part they took in them, and for publishing the accounts as they stand, alters not the case. It will surely be more to the credit of the writers, who may hereafter undertake the "Defence of our Fathers," and it will serve as a more substantial "defence" to the "fathers" themselves, to *disprove* those *facts*, and demonstrate by documentary evidence that the statements I here make, are *untrue*, than to be wasting time, misleading the reader, or venting their malignity, by commenting upon *my opinion* respecting Mr. Asbury. If ever Mr. E. should write again, he is requested to confine himself to the *facts* in the case, and not to pass over in silence some of the most material parts of my present work, as he has done many things which are inserted and remain unanswered, in my *History and Mystery of Methodist Episcopacy*.

Having taken this view of Mr. Asbury's sentiments respecting church government, his principles, and the probable influence which they had in the adoption of the episcopal form of government, it will be necessary to notice those letters to which I made reference above ; as Mr. E. with a dexterity peculiar to himself, has attempted to lessen the force of the testimony of some ; and to set others entirely aside, "as unentitled to one particle of credit."

The first is a letter addressed to Mr. Asbury, and is dated
"London, Sept. 20th, 1788.

"There is, indeed, a wide difference between the relation wherein you stand to the American Methodists, and the relation wherein I stand to *all* the Methodists. You are the elder brother of the American Methodists ; I am, under God, the father of the whole family. Therefore, I, naturally, care for you all, in a manner no other person can do. Therefore, I, in a measure, provide for you all ; for the supplies which Dr. Coke provides for you, he could not provide, were it not for me : were it not that I not only permit him to collect, but support him in so doing.

But in one point, my dear brother, I am a little afraid both the doctor and you dither from me. I study to be little, you study to be great; I creep, you strut along. I found a school, you a college. Nay, and call it after your own names! O beware! Do not seek to be something! Let me be nothing, and Christ be all in all.

"One instance, of this your greatness, has given me great concern. How can you, how dare you, suffer yourself to be called a *bishop*? I shudder, I start at the very thought. Men may call me a knave, or a fool, a rascal, a scoundrel, and I am content; but they shall never, by my consent call me a bishop! For my sake, for God's sake, for Christ's sake, put a full end to this. Let the Presbyterians do what they please, but let the Methodists know their calling better.

"Thus, my dear Franky, I have told you all that is in my heart, and let this, when I am no more seen, bear witness, how sincerely I am your affectionate friend and brother,

JOHN WESLEY."

Moore's Life of Wesley, vol. 2, p. 285.

Respecting this letter, which Mr. E. has been careful to keep out of sight, he says, "Mr. McGaine, indeed, rejoices over it, as one who has found great spoil. He seems delighted with it." Def. p. 47. To this I reply, it is a fact, that I am "delighted with it," and I will tell Mr. E. why I am so. *First*. Because it has afforded my mind relief, by removing doubts and difficulties, respecting the organization of the Methodist episcopal church, under which I had laboured for several years. I had often read in the records of the church, that Mr. Wesley recommended the *episcopal form of government*; but where that recommendation was to be found, I could not tell. It is affirmed, also, in the book of minutes, that Mr. Wesley's circular letter "will afford as good an explanation as can be given of this subject." This letter never was, to me, any explanation at all; nor did it contain one single reason, why the episcopal form should be adopted, in preference to any other. I, therefore, wished to obtain information upon the subject, and this letter has fully satisfied my mind that there never was any "recommendation" or "counsel" given to adopt the episcopal form of church government. On account of the satisfaction I have derived from it, I "rejoice over it as one who has found great spoil;" and have made my acknowledgments, by letter, to the Rev. Mr. Moore for publishing it, and have thanked God, that in the order of his providence, a document of so much importance, which had been kept secret so long, has at last been brought to light.

I "rejoice over it," because it is the Truth; and Mr. E. knows that it is affirmed of goodness, "it rejoiceth not in iniquity, but it rejoiceth in the Truth." From his censure, it is evident that he does not rejoice over it. That he is sorry it

was published ; and, if it were in his power, that he would hide it from public view. And wherefore ? What has the "Defence of our Fathers" to dread from the publication of Truth ? We know who has said, ' every one, that doeth evil *hateth the light* neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be re-proved.'

I do "rejoice over it," because, by exposing the truth, it is likely to break the power of despotism in the church, and restore to the injured members, their liberties and their rights. Wherever this letter shall be read and duly considered I think it will be impossible for any disinterested man to believe, that Methodist episcopacy is of Mr. Wesley's creating. The people will see by it, that they have been deceived by the statements which have been published. They will see that Mr. Wesley never recommended never approved of episcopacy, or the episcopal form of government for the Methodist societies in America. They will have confirmation of what the Rev. Mr. Moore, Mr. Wesley's biographer has said, "that Mr. Wesley *never gave his sanction* to any of these things" Finding, that Dr. Coke "*went farther than Mr. Wesley intended*" and that they have been imposed upon, they will one day rise in the majesty of their strength, and demand *representation* : nor will they rest until like freemen they have a voice personally, or by their representatives, in making those laws by which they are to be governed. Believing that this change would be for the happiness of the present and future generations, I "rejoice over this letter as one who has found great spoil."

"This letter to Mr. Asbury contains expressions too severe." Mr. Asbury very fitly denominated it, "*a bitter pill*:" such he found it, and such Mr. E. finds it ; the very sight of it produces nausea. 'But why are the expressions "too severe ?" They are not too severe for the occasion, as the event showed. For the man who could resist the entreaties of Mr. Wesley, his "father," his benefactor, his "friend," and these entreaties urged too, with such appeals as the following, "for my sake, for God's sake, for Christ's sake," gave proof that he was willing to sacrifice every thing for the title of *bishop*. They are not "too severe," in the apprehension of the dangers the parties were in, who from vanity or pride, assumed the title of *bishop* Not "too severe," for having departed from the instructions which had been given "*in the most solemn manner*," not to assume the title of *bishop*. But on the supposition that Mr. Wesley "recommended" the episcopal form of government, they are not only "too severe," but they cannot be defended at all. On such a supposition, a letter containing such expressions as are to be found in this, would be a proof of madness, rather than of a sound mind.

Mr. E. says, I have "wholly misrepresented its import." Wonderful man ! Prodigy of nature ! where shall we find his fellow : for it seems no man can understand the most plain and simple statement but himself. Surely the Methodist episcopal church ought to pray for his long life, for when he dies wisdom will die with him ! And what is the import of this letter according to Mr. E's showing ? Why, that "Mr. Wesley's sole objection to the term *bishop*, was from the associations ordinarily connected with it in the public mind in England" !!! Any man who reads Mr. Wesley's letter, and can believe Mr. E's assertion is not to be reasoned with. But I have no idea that there will be many found who will believe it : it is so repugnant to common sense that it defies belief.

The next to be noticed is Dr. Coke's letter to Mr. Wesley, which contains this sentence : "Mr. Brackenbury informed me at Leeds, that he saw a letter in London from Mr. Asbury, in which he observed, that he would not receive any person deputed by you, to take any part of the superintendency of the work invested in him, or words evidently implying so much." And upon this Mr. E. remarks : "Mr. Brackenbury might have been *mistaken*"—again. "how easily might he have *mistaken* their meaning," the meaning of the expressions in the letter. And again, "Had we before us also the letter of Mr. Asbury, to which Mr. Brackenbury alluded, we might perhaps, be able to show some equal *mistake*. We object, therefore, to this parol, third handed report ; and unless the document itself be produced, we protest against the statement." Def. p. 53.

Mr. E. must, certainly, be a pupil of the celebrated Italian, Theodore Majocchi, who was a principal witness against the late queen of England, when on her trial. This man, so long as he was allowed to go on, and tell his own story, would go on very glibly : but whenever he was pinched by the questions of the queen's counsel, he always had one answer to make, "*Non mi recordi.*" Just so with Mr. E. As long as he is permitted to tell his own tale, he seems to do pretty well. But whenever he is pinched by some unmanageable document, that intercepts his way, like a cross question from an examining counsel, then he has one uniform way of disposing of it, the writer was "*mistaken.*" As it respects the case before us, it was not only Mr. Brackenbury who was "*mistaken,*" but Dr. Coke must have been "*mistaken*" also. Otherwise, Dr. Coke urged Mr. Asbury's opposition to receive a person deputed by Mr. Wesley, as a reason why Mr. Wesley should ordain preachers for America, when at the same time, he knew that the statement made by Mr. Brackenbury was not correct, and that he "*was mistaken,*" in the meaning he attached to the words in the letter. How far this differs from using *deceit*, or uttering a *falsehood*, I will leave the reader to judge.

"In another letter," says Mr. E. "dated October 31, 1789, Mr. M'Caine represents Mr. Wesley as saying of Mr. Asbury, 'He flatly refused to receive Mr. Whatcoat in the character I sent him.' Now this could not have been." Def. p. 53. This is not *my representation*, the words are Mr. Wesley's own. And as for the phrase, "Now this could not have been," it is only another way of expressing the old answer, "he was *mistaken*." So then Mr. Wesley was "mistaken." Dr. Coke was "mistaken." Mr. Brackenbury was "mistaken." Bishop White was "mistaken." Every body is "mistaken" except Mr. Emory! What excessive *modesty*, or rather, what presumptive arrogance. I shall now present the reader with this letter, and he may judge for himself, who is mistaken.

"London, October 31, 1789.

"My dear Brother,—The point you desire my thoughts upon, is doubtless of no common importance. And I will give you my settled thoughts concerning it without the least disguise or reserve. Indeed, this has been always my manner of speaking when I speak of the things of God. It should be so now in particular, as these may probably be the last words that you will receive from me.

It pleased God sixty years ago, by me, to awaken and join together, a little company in London, whence they spread throughout the land. Some time after, I was much importuned to send some of my children to America, to which I cheerfully consented. God prospered their labours: but they and their children still esteemed themselves one family; no otherwise divided, than as Methodists on one side of the Thames are divided from the other. I was therefore, a little surprized when *I received some letters from Mr. Asbury, affirming that no person in Europe knew how to direct those in America*. Soon after, he flatly refused to receive Mr. Whatcoat in the character I sent him.

He told George Shadford, 'Mr. Wesley and I are like Caesar and Pompey—he will bear no equal, and I will bear no superior.' And accordingly he quietly sat by, until his friends, by common consent, voted my name out of the American minutes. This completed the matter, and shewed he had no connexion with me."

"But how happens it" says Mr. E. "that Mr. M'Caine has told us nothing more about this letter? Why did he not state to whom it was written, and from what authority he received it?" Strange questions, indeed, coming from a man who would wish to be understood as not intending to *deceive*. And who in the course of two sentences adds, "*The documents in proof of all this are in our possession*." Def. p. 54. Did not Mr. E. know, then, where I obtained it? Did he not know, from what authority I received it? The documents in his "*possession*" told him all this, and they told him *much more* which he was very willing to keep back. It was not, therefore, to obtain informa-

tion upon those points that Mr. E. proposed his questions; for the "documents," giving all the information he called for, he tells us, he had "in his possession." But it was for the purpose of conveying an *inuendo*, that I forged or fabricated this "noted letter," a charge of which, he had too much *cunning* openly to make? Perhaps he thought a few intervening lines between the name of "Mr. M'Caine," and the terms "corruption and fabrication," would not present an obstacle of such magnitude, as that the sharp sighted reader would not perceive the intended connexion between the name and the thing. "The aforesaid noted letter bears on the face of it marks of *corruption* or of *fabrication*. And until better authority is produced for it, or the document itself, we hold it unentitled to one particle of credit."

As Mr. E. pronounces this letter to be a forgery "bearing on the face of it marks of corruption or of fabrication," and "holds it unentitled to one particle of credit," I should like very much, to have an opportunity to ask him a few questions respecting this letter *under oath*, in a court of justice. I am very much mistaken if I would not extort from him, a very different verdict, from that which he has recorded above. But as I shall never have that opportunity, I shall go on, and produce "better authority" for its authenticity, than he can for its "corruption or fabrication."

First. This "noted letter" was published by Rev. Wm Hammett, in his controversy with Rev. Thomas Morrell, in Charleston, South-Carolina, in 1792. And I never heard that Mr. Morrell doubted its authenticity. If Mr. E. believed that it was forged, it was a very easy matter for him to write to Mr. Morrell in Elizabeth-Town, New-Jersey; and if Mr. Morrell pronounced it a forgery, Mr. E. could publish that certificate, as he did the certificate of the same gentleman, respecting the address to general Washington. *Secondly.* From a *manuscript-note* in Mr. Hammett's pamphlet, now lying before me, I find that this "noted letter" was addressed to Rev. Beverly Allen, formerly a very distinguished Methodist preacher in the southern States. Whether this was the case or not; or by whom that note was *written*, I do not know. *Thirdly.* In a printed note in said pamphlet, page 23, Mr. Hammett says, "When the first edition of this pamphlet came from the press, the Rev. Mr. Cooper, (resident minister in the M. E. church) called on me to see the original; and was *fully convinced*, it was Mr. Wesley's own hand writing and sentiments, as he corresponded with him, before his death, some time." If this was the Rev. Ezk. Cooper, he was at Mr. E's elbow when he was writing his "Defence of our Fathers:" It is therefore reasonable to suppose, that he would inquire of Mr. Cooper, if Mr. Hammett's statement was true? If he ever saw this "noted letter"? and if the "handwriting was Mr. Wesley's"? If Mr. Cooper was at a distance, Mr. E. could

obtain information upon these points by letter. If he neglected to take this step, he is extremely culpable. But if he did in any way, come at the knowledge of the authenticity of the above letter—if he did know, when he wrote his “Defence of our Fathers,” (and I believe he did) that what Mr. Hammett said respecting it, was true, then the community is left to judge of Mr. E’s truth and integrity for having said that this “noted letter bears on its face the marks of corruption or of fabrication.”

Fourthly. Mr. Asbury says, respecting this letter, “Saturday 24th I attended quarterly meeting at the widow Flint’s. Here I had the first sight of Mr. Hammett’s and brother Morrell’s attacks on each other; or rather Mr. Hammett’s against the Methodists, and brother Morrell’s reply. Had brother M. known more, he would have replied better. Mr. H’s quotation of a clause in my confidential letter to brother S——d (Shadford) is not altogether just.” Journals, Vol. 2. p. 131. Now what is there here to prove “corruption or fabrication?” Does not Mr. Asbury acknowledge that he had seen Mr. Hammett’s pamphlet in which this letter was published? Does he not acknowledge that he had read this letter? Does he not admit its authenticity by referring to it without any expression of doubt or denial? Does he not admit it to be from Mr. Wesley, by acknowledging the truth of the “quotation of a clause in his *confidential letter*,” with only a small qualification “it was not *altogether just*.” And yet Mr. E. says “this noted letter bears on the face of it the marks of corruption or of fabrication”!!

Fifthly. In one of Mr. Asbury’s letters dated August 6th 18’6, now before me, he says, “On the momentous matter you write, I must be prudent. I have suffered by a change of things with Mr. Wesley. When it was thought some persons should come from England to preside, George Shadford was in contemplation. I wrote to him, and it was applied to Mr. Wesley; what a mistake?” Here is farther testimony from Mr. Asbury; and does he deny the authenticity of Mr. Wesley’s letter which contains the expressions he wrote to George Shadford? He does not. Does he deny having written these words? He does not. He admits he wrote them; but says, they were “applied to Mr. Wesley” by “mistake.” And yet Mr. E. would pronounce this “noted letter” a forgery, “unentitled to one particle of credit.” It may agree with the principles and suit the interests of some little petty fogging village lawyer, who regards neither truth nor justice, so that he gets his fee, to attempt to set aside some important document, as unentitled to one particle of credit: but for a minister of Jesus Christ to resort to such stratagems, is enough, to make, if possible, an angel weep.

Having disposed of these letters, I must detain the reader, a few moments, to notice a short paragraph which reads thus. “Alas! what a friend have the venerated dead found in Mr. McCaine! He has a *great veneration* for their memory! Yet

while he salutes, he stabs them. He kisses, and straightway leads them to be crucified." Def. p. 50. As Mr. E. has compared me to two of the worst characters in sacred or profane history, and has imputed to me crimes the most base and infamous, I must be allowed to say a few words in reply.

1. Mr. E. in his preface informed his readers, that "in preparing this defence, the Divine assistance has been asked—in sending it abroad, the Divine blessing is now implored." Can the pious reader believe one word of what is here stated? Can he believe that Mr. E. asked and obtained the Divine assistance to write a book containing such a passage? Can he conceive what kind of a prayer he put up when he implored the Divine blessing upon this sentence? If he prayed at all, there is no instance in history with which his conduct can be compared with more justness than with that of lord Verulam, who placing his infidel book in the window of his chamber, kneeled down and asked God to grant his blessing to a work, written expressly to prove Revelation to be a lie.

2. Those who are acquainted with the Scriptures, need not be told, that the persons whom Mr. E. had in his eye, when he wrote the above paragraph, were Joab and Judas: and that their crimes involve treachery, hypocrisy, perfidy, venality, and in short, every thing that is mean and wicked. Alas! for Mr. E. that he should have alluded to either Joab or Judas. He is the last man in the world that ought to have mentioned their names, or glanced at their conduct. As long as some men are alive, he ought to have observed silence about "saluting and stabbing—kissing and crucifying." I shall not, however, at this time, offer either specification or proof that these charges are applicable to Mr. E. himself. This I shall do whenever he demands it. All I shall say at present is, that not a syllable of what he has said will apply to me.

3. As the case of the *apostate* Judas has been introduced, it may not be amiss to notice, first his crime,—next his punishment. His crime consisted of covetousness; and this may have had its origin and consummation, in his carrying the bag. In perfidy; he betrayed his friend. In hypocrisy; he saluted that friend with a kiss. In venality; he sold him for thirty pieces of silver. If the opinion of some men be correct, Judas thought that Jesus would have delivered himself, by a miracle, from the hands of his enemies, and that he would, in that case, not only have retained his office, but would have had the purchase money, clear gains. If this was his cool, calculating cunning, the event shows how much he was mistaken. His punishment consisted in the loss of the friendship of the Saviour, and of the Saviour's friends. In the loss of his bishoprick—in the loss of his character—in the loss of his peace of mind—in the loss of a good conscience—in the loss of his life—in the loss of his soul—in the loss of heaven.

Would it be amiss, therefore, for some men to think of the crime and punishment of Judas ? I think not. For, to confine my remarks to the subject which has agitated the Methodist episcopal church, some have been known, and others have been reported, to have declared themselves in favor of reform. Some of these have composed verses lampooning the government of the church, and have sung or repeated those verses in different parts of their circuits. Some have fearlessly advocated reform in the general conference. Some have written and published their sentiments on the same subject. Some have boldly contended for the rights of the people in the presence of, and even against the bishops. Whilst others have declared themselves on the same side of the question in conversation with the private members. And what then ? It is a well known fact, that these very men have changed, or have acted as if they had changed their principles. Now I would explicitly say, that I respect the man who has an opinion of his own, and acts consistently with that opinion; whether he agrees with me, in sentiment, or not. And, that I commend the man who renounces an erroneous opinion, as soon as he discovers that opinion to be erroneous. I do not say a word, therefore, against either of these classes; my remarks are intended *solely* and *exclusively*, for men of a different description. For men who change their *principles* with their *circuits*; as if the *nature of truth* changed with the *quantum of their support*. It is against these *apostates* from principle, I write. Against men who feel as if they were in the very precincts of pauperism; and although "Divinely authorised" as they say, are at a loss to determine whether to preach the gospel, or follow some other *profession*. Against men who seem to have labelled themselves with the inscription to be seen on *empty* houses, "To Let:" and whose inquiry is, in the language of Judas, "what will you give me, and I will deliver him unto you" Where is the faith of these men that they cannot trust God ? Where is their consistency of character as ministers of Jesus Christ ? Where is their independence and nobleness of mind as men ? Who can respect them ? Who will place confidence in them ? Such ought to reflect on the cases of those, in the New Testament, who were inclined to traffick in things pertaining to God. Simon Magus offered to purchase the power to impart the Holy Ghost; and Judas Iscariot sold his Saviour for thirty pieces of silver. The fate of these individuals admonish all of the evil and danger of either buying or selling the truth, for the sake of "filthy lucre" From their history, we may learn, that the case of him who *receives*, and of him who *gives* a price for principle is alike hopeless. That although, Peter, who denied his Lord and Master, with oaths and curses, afterwards found acceptance with the Saviour, Judas did not. And that there is no ground to hope for the salvation of

any who would basely make merchandise of grace, or sacrifice truth for gain.



SECTION X.—*Testimonies of English Methodists.*

WHAT are the "testimonies of the English Methodists"? They allow that "Mr. Wesley established the validity of presbyterian ordination." And Mr. E. adds, "who ever disputed this?" As he admits this point, it may be necessary to ascertain the meaning of the phrase, "presbyterian ordination." 1. It may mean such an ordination as the presbyterians practise; in that case only one order of ministers is recognised. This parity of ministers did not agree with Mr. Wesley's views, for he said there were *two orders*, presbyters and deacons. 2. Or it may mean, ordination by the hands of presbyters alone, as contradistinguished from ordination by a third order of ministers called *bishops*. Among presbyterians no higher order is acknowledged than that of a presbyter; nor can presbyters create a higher order than themselves, for no stream can rise higher than its head, spring, or fountain. In this view of the subject, we have but two orders of ministers, presbyters and deacons, which perfectly harmonizes with Mr. Wesley's views. With this explanation of a presbyterian ordination, with which the practice of the English Methodists, who have no bishops, corresponds, their testimony is adverse to the claims of Methodist episcopacy.

2. Mr. E. has not forgotten to let his readers know, that he was at "the British conference held in Liverpool in 1820,* and that he heard the profoundly learned Dr. Adam Clarke, and that most able and eloquent divine, the Rev. Richard Watson, express themselves publicly before the conference, in relation to our episcopacy, to the same effect, as a *true, actual, scriptural episcopacy* of the most *genuine* and *apostolical* character." Def. p. 48. All this the reader is to take upon Mr. E's *ipse dixit*, and take it just as he gives it; because, although Mr. Wesley, Dr. Coke, Mr. Brackenbury, bishop White, and a thousand others may "mistake," Mr. E. cannot. "But how happens it" that these "profoundly learned" and "eloquent" gentlemen, did not

* The public were informed of the same fact, by the following notice in a Canada paper "At a meeting of the stewards and leaders of the WESLEYAN METHODIST SOCIETY, held in Kingston this day—It was resolved that a remonstrance be sent to the *British Missionary Committee*, against their late decision, relative to the withdrawing their Missionary from this place, and that the sense of the public be obtained by receiving signatures to a petition for the *continuance of a British Missionary here*. This is on the presumption, that *misrepresentations have been made to the committee, by the American delegate* The particulars of which on their arrival, will be laid before the public. As British subjects, we are resolved to support a British Missionary. By order, N. McLEOD, Sec'y." Kingston, Nov. 6th, 1820.

define our "episcopacy !" I suspect they did not use the term "episcopacy" in its popular acceptation, as an episcopacy of the *third order* ; such an "episcopacy" as is in the "church of England." If these learned and eloquent gentlemen had used the term in that sense, they would not have found it necessary to qualify the term, by employing all the adjunctive epithets, which Mr. E. says, they connected with it. They must, therefore, have meant, that "our episcopacy" is such an episcopacy as Mr. Wesley explained in his Notes on the New Testament already quoted ; and such as Lord King laid down, where presbyters and bishops are the same order. In that case, "the testimonies of the English Methodists" are in favor of my position, and opposed to the claims of "our episcopacy."

3. At the organization of the church, the preachers assumed the title "the Methodist episcopal church ;" and down to the present time, it has been asserted, Mr. Wesley recommended the episcopal form of government. This assertion I have denied ; and among other reasons for my opinion, I offer this as one : "*there exists no document in which the words Methodist episcopal church, were ever written by Mr. Wesley*" Although nothing of the kind can be produced, yet Mr. E. claims the "testimonies of the English Methodists" in favor of the title, and in support of "our episcopacy." Let us see some of the proofs.

In the English Magazine for 1809, there is a likeness of Mr. Asbury, taken by the direction of the British conference, which must be considered as an official act, with this inscription : "Mr. Francis Asbury, General Superintendent of the Methodist societies in the United States of America." Two things may be noticed here. 1. Mr. Asbury is not styled a "bishop," but a "*general superintendent*" 2. The societies are not denominated the "Methodist episcopal church ;" but, simply, the "Methodist societies." In the Magazine for 1822 there is a print of Mr. Emory himself, taken by order of the British conference. This print bears this inscription : "Rev. John Emory, Representative from the American conference of the people called Methodists, to the English conference, 1820." What makes the omission of the title the "Methodist episcopal church" the more remarkable in this case is, that "at the request of the conference" Mr. E. furnished a copy of the sermon preached before that body, with the following heading, "The substance of a Sermon preached in Liverpool on the 30th of July, 1820, before the conference of the Ministers late in connexion with Rev. John Wesley. By JOHN EMORY ; the Representative of the General conference of the *Methodist episcopal church*, in America." And also, in his note of inscription to the conference, he styles himself "the Representative of the General conference of the *Methodist episcopal church*." But although he was thus particular to give the title, the "Methodist episco-

pal church" twice, and even to place it in capital letters, all would not do. The English conference would not combine with the American representative to acknowledge the title.

4. As it respects the case of the pictures, it may be supposed that the omission, in the inscription, was a blunder of the artist, and that the conference was not answerable for his mistake. But no such excuse can be pleaded or allowed for official documents emanating from the conference, in their official capacity, signed by their president, and countersigned by their secretary. The first of these documents, or addresses, may be found in the British Minutes for 1796, and is headed thus: "To the General Conference of the people called Methodists, in America: signed Thomas Taylor, president; Samuel Bradburn, secretary." Having assumed the title "the Methodist episcopal church," the general conference might have felt themselves justifiable in demanding a recognition of their title. They might have insisted on the fitness of such a recognition, and have found instances to justify its propriety. When "Lord Howe addressed a letter to George Washington, Esquire, the general refused to receive it, as it did not acknowledge the public character with which he was invested by Congress." Marshall's Life of Washington, vol. 2, p. 420. But, although the conference received the address, yet they, whose duty it was *to direct* the answer, as if stung by the indignity offered by the omission of the title "Methodist episcopal church," or as gently reminding their British brethren of their mistake, directed their answer in the same manner, "To the *general* conference of the *people called Methodists* in Great Britain." This answer was signed by "Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury." Here I would remark, that the British conference is not styled, by themselves, or by their brethren of the Irish conference, the "*general* conference." The title they assume is simply, the British conference. To have added therefore, the epithet "*general*," to the term conference, was, to say the least of it, unnecessary.

Whatever may have been the object of those who *directed* the above answer, the British conference were not to be diverted from their purpose: they were neither to be flattered, nor driven to adopt the title the "Methodist episcopal church" in their addresses. For in the next year they sent another official communication, directed "To Mr. Francis Asbury, and all the conferences of the people called Methodists in America." See the British minutes for 1797.

The next communication they sent is to be found in their minutes for 1799, the title of which runs thus: "The Address of the British conference, to the general conference in America." And in 1803, they sent another address entitled, "The address of the British conference, to the general conference of

the Methodists in America" In 1807 there is another, "The address from the British, to the Methodist's general conference in America" Besides these, the British conference occasionally speaking of their brethren on this side the Atlantic, speak of them, on their minutes, not as the "Methodist episcopal church," but as "the Methodist societies in the United States of America"—"The American Methodist connexion &c." It is, therefore, a singular fact, and perhaps but little known, that this boasted title, the "Methodist episcopal church;" and this no less pompous appellation "bishop," are not to be found in these British *official papers*: nor is there any proof, that I have been able to find that either of these titles appears in their minutes, any more than they do in Mr. Wesley's writings. Such are the "testimonies of the English Methodists."



SECTION XI.—*Dr. Coke.*

RESERVING the remarks I intend to make upon the *causes* which gave rise to the charges preferred against Dr. Coke, in the British conference, upon his return to England, until I come to the section, which treats of the "Address to general Washington," I shall first notice those charges with their punishment,—next, the defence which Mr. E. has set up.

As to the charges, much need not be said on them; as Mr. E. expressly states, that "an address was drawn up, and signed by Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury, in behalf of the American Methodists, and presented to Gen. Washington." Def. p. 60. And on the next page he says, "a copy of this address was introduced into the British conference, as a ground of censure against the doctor."—"Dr. Coke heard these charges urged against him in PROFOUND SILENCE." If there be no "mystery" about *this* address, there is, certainly, something connected with it, that I do not yet fully understand. I should like to know, if there were *two* addresses, drawn up and presented, by Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury, to general Washington? The one in 1785, when the general was a private citizen; the other in 1789, when he was president of the American Congress? As Mr. E. according to his own statement, has "examined this subject minutely," he ought to have told us whether there were two addresses, or whether there was only one. If there were *two*, I would like to know wherein did they differ in their nature, and what were the objects intended to be effected by each? I can find, however, no evidence that there were two: Mr. E. therefore, must clear up this matter.

Secondly. I should like to know what was the *date* of the address, "a copy of which" Mr. E. says, "was introduced into the British conference as a ground of censure against the doctor." This is an important matter, and should be well remem-

bered. But, says Mr. E. "Mr. Drew seems indeed to have been left in peculiar embarrassment, with regard to dates, in consequence of the death of Dr. Coke at sea, before he arranged his papers in chronological order." Def. p. 81. On this I remark, 1. It is not likely, that Dr. Coke, who had made all the previous and necessary arrangements for the publication of his papers, selecting his biographer, and placing the papers in his possession, would neglect the chronological arrangement of those papers; especially, as he was, at that time, an old man, was going a voyage to India, expected to be gone a long time, and was fully sensible of the uncertainty of life. To me, the thing is very improbable. 2. But, for argument sake, admitting it to be a fact, how could I be expected to fix dates to those documents, where dates were wanting, if Mr. Drew was "embarrassed," with all Dr. Coke's papers before his eyes? And if he erred on that point, how can I be blamed for copying him, unless I had the means of correcting *his* mistakes, which I had not. But to return to dates, Mr. E. does not gainsay, that this address was presented to general Washington in '85; for he assures us it "was introduced into the British conference upon the doctor's return to England in that year." And yet, in Mr. Sparks's letter, that gentleman says, "It is not likely that any address from any quarter was presented to Washington in 1785. I have never seen any of that year. He was then a private man, wholly employed with his farms."

Thirdly If no address had been presented, no charge could have been predicated upon such an address: consequently, no punishment could have been inflicted. But Mr. E. says "such was the punishment, then, of Dr. Coke. Such the cause that led to it. Such the profound silence with which he heard the charge." Def. p. 61. I ask, now, how came the doctor to be *punished*, if no *charge* was preferred? And how came the *charge* to be preferred, if no *address* was presented? These are questions, which Mr. E. will have to answer in his next, as he has "examined this subject minutely."

The punishment. "It was finally determined that the name of Dr. Coke should be omitted in the minutes for the *succeeding year*." Def. p. 61. Although this statement is as plain as language can express it, yet Mr. E. attempts to set it aside. Hear what he says. "At this very conference of 1785, Dr. Coke's name appears in the British minutes in London &c." Def. p. 43. Let the reader, now, mark Mr. E.'s disingenuousness. The question is not, does Dr. Coke's name appear on the minutes for 1785: but does it appear on the minutes for the "*succeeding year*," which is not 1785, but 1786? That is the question. I affirmed it does not appear on the minutes for 1786; and I affirm so still. But Mr. E. says, "at this very conference of 1785 Dr. Coke's name appears on those minutes." Really; this is very cunning. It is just as if I

had said, A. B. died in 1786. O no, says Mr. E., that is a *mis-take*, for he was in London, in 1785 !! Mr. E. makes another blunder; for in speaking of Dr. Coke's Journals, he expresses himself thus. "In this dedication, Dr. Coke states, that he had found in Mr. Wesley a father and a friend for *thirteen years*. If we compare this with the period at which Dr. Coke became connected with Mr Wesley, which was between Aug. 1776 and Aug. 1777, it will just bring us down to the date of the preface; and this date, too, is in that very year (conference year) in which *Dr Coke's name was left off the British minutes.*" Def. p. 59. Now let us go to work and see what we can make out of this statement. "Thirteen years" added to 1777 will give 1790. So far Mr. E. is correct; for Dr. Coke's preface to his Journals is dated "Jan. 25, 1790." Secondly. Mr. E. says, "this date (1790) is the very year in which Dr. Coke's name was left off the British minutes." This is wrong. For his name stands on the British minutes in 1790. It was left off in the year 1786. Thirdly. Although in this place Mr. E. says, "Dr. Coke's name was left off the British minutes in 1790," yet he contradicts it and says on page 43 "in 1790, he (Dr. Coke) was again stationed in London with John and Charles Wesley." Fourthly. Although he stationed the doctor in London with Charles Wesley in 1790, Charles Wesley had been dead, at that time, two years and four months. So much for Mr E's accuracy. Fifthly. On the supposition that no address was drawn up and presented to general Washington in 1785 by Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury; will Mr. E. tell us, what was the nature or character of the charges, which were preferred against Dr. Coke, in the British conference, that year? If the doctor was punished, as Mr. E. acknowledges he was, for charges which were preferred against him at that conference, it will be required of Mr. E. to prove, that those charges, and this punishment had no connexion with the organization of the church, or the assumption of the title "Methodist episcopal church."

The next thing to be considered is the defence set up by Mr. E. He complains that in presenting this affair from Drew's work, I have not presented "the subject fully." To mend what I had spoiled, or supply what I had omitted, he proposes to give "a few fuller extracts from the same pages, from which Mr. McCaine took his, which will place the subject in the fair and candid light, in which it was regarded by Dr. Coke's more magnanimous biographer." Def. p. 60. The attention of the reader is particularly requested to the following novel, and unprecedented manner of composing this defence; which, if it does not discover a great deal of *fairness* and *truth*, manifests, at least, a great deal of originality and cunning. If the reader will take Mr. E's "Defence of our Fathers," which work has been called by the *seven wise men* "a masterly defence," he will find a quotation,

or that which purports to be a quotation, beginning on the 60th page with these words, "It is well known," and continued to the bottom of the 61st page. Reference is then made to "Drew's Life of Coke pp. 102—145."

Whoever examines this apparent extract, which, in Mr. E's book, does not constitute one page and a half, and which, from the face of it, has the appearance of being a fair and unbroken quotation, will feel himself a little at a loss to conceive, how Mr. E. could compress the contents of forty-four octavo pages, of Drew's Life of Coke, into less than a page and a half of his own book. This "mystery" I will now explain. Mr. E. has a newly invented *mill*, (I do not know that he has taken out a patent for it, or that he thinks it necessary) far exceeding the "miraculous mill," for grinding old people young; a picture of which I can recollect to have seen, when I was boy. Into his *mill* Mr. E. puts forty-four octavo pages of "Drew's Life of Coke." And after turning the crank a few times, a beautiful fine *dust* is produced, which after he has bolted and sifted it sufficiently, is nicely put up, and stamped by the inspectors, *superfine*. The doctor also examines it, and pronounces it to be not only exceedingly palatable, but very wholesome and nutritious. The bolting apparatus is also very nice; and displays a great deal of ingenuity in its construction. In short, taking it altogether, there is nothing like it in the United States: perhaps not in the world. To be a little more particular, and with a view of explaining the process of grinding, Mr. E. begins with page 102 of Drew's book, and selects from that page 38 words. Here, it may not be amiss to inform the reader, that these 38 words do not follow one another in close and consecutive order. The first line, where the quotation begins, furnishes 4 words, then a whole line is omitted and the quotation is continued. It may be proper, also, to add, that the other quotations are made in the same way: a few words from one sentence, and a few from another, nor is there any attention paid to stops—nor to sentences—nor to paragraphs—nor to pages—nor even to chapters. The first part of the quotation, being part of the 6th chapter; the latter part of the quotation being part of the 8th chapter: and that whenever a word comes in his way, which does not suit his purpose, or is likely to injure or retard the *mill*, it is thrown away, and another substituted. Having now explained the process of grinding, I shall go on with the account. There are taken, I say, from the 102nd page, 38 words.—From the 104th page, 136 words.—From the 105th page 55½ words.—From the 106th page 176½ words.—From the 144th page, 237 words—and from the 145th page 27 words. What the reader may say, of Mr. E. and his *magical mill*, I know not. But I will leave him to grind as long as he lives, nor will I envy him the *praise* he may receive for his mechanical genius; nor the applause he may obtain for his *superfine dust*.

One thing more deserves notice. In composing this defence for Dr. Coke, Mr. E. has placed him in a situation, by no means enviable. Perhaps he intended to pay the doctor a compliment, but unfortunately the comparison is an unhappy one. The subject, to which Mr. E. refers, I would suppose to be Ithuriel's search for Satan in the garden of Eden; and the comparison, is the manner in which the doctor bore the touch of Ithuriel's spear, when the charges were preferred against him, in the British conference.

"So saying, on he led his radiant files
Dazzling the moon, these to the bower direct
In search of whom they sought; him there they found
Squat like a toad, close at the ear of Eve
Assaying by his devilish art, to reach
The organs, of her fancy.....
Him thus intent, *Ithuriel with his spear*
Touched lightly; for no falsehood can endure
Touch of celestial temper, but returns
Of force to its own likeness: up he starts
Discovered and surprized"

Milton's Paradise Lost. B. IV. l. 797 et seq.

Did Mr. E. intend, by reference to the above, to compare doctor Coke in America, to Satan in the garden of Eden? Did he leave it to be inferred, that the doctor had practised his wily arts here, as Satan had practised his "devilish art" there? And that when found out, and charged with these practices, in the British conference, he could no more bear the touch of the Spear *Truth*, than Satan could the touch of Ithuriel's? That as Satan "started up, discovered and surprized" so the doctor heard the charges in "PROFOUND SILENCE?" And Mr. E.'s work is called a "Defence of our Fathers;" and Dr. Bond pronounces the work to be "an able defence!" Query. Does Dr. Bond know any thing about Ithuriel's spear? I doubt it. If it were to touch *him* perhaps he would *feel* as if he was touched with a red-hot poker. Leaving Mr. E. and Dr. Bond to clear up this matter for the satisfaction of the seven wise men, I shall proceed to the consideration of the next section.



SECTION XII.—*Methodist Episcopacy.*

I FIND but little in this section worthy of remark, that has not been reviewed already. It is principally made up of extracts from the "notes on the discipline, prepared by Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury, at the request of the general conference:" and contains comments by Mr. E. on these extracts. It ought to be known, however, that these "notes" have been long since given to the moles and the bats; and now, it is a rare thing to see a copy of the book. That I may not be thought to pass them over in silence, I shall select a few articles.

1. "The most bigotted devotees to religious establishments (the clergy of the church of Rome excepted) are now ashamed to support the doctrine of the apostolic, uninterrupted succession of bishops." Will Mr. E. answer the following questions. Is not the "apostolic and uninterrupted succession," the very foundation of *Jure Divino*? If these subjects differ, let him say wherein? Again, what is the difference between *Jure Divino*, and "Divine Authority?" See Mr. Asbury's Journals, Vol 3. p. 168. Wherein does "Divine Authority" differ from being "Divinely authorised." See "Report of the committee on petitions and memorials. John Emory, chairman," in the Christian Advocate and Journal of June 20. 1828. And how can any of these agree with "the principles of the *law of nature*." Def. p. 7. *Note.*

2. "Nor must we omit to observe" (speaking of primitive episcopacy) "that each diocess had a college of elders or presbyters, in which the bishop presided." Was this bishop of the *same order* as his brethren, of the college of presbyters? If he was, a Methodist bishop differs from a primitive bishop, and Methodist episcopacy is very different from primitive episcopacy. If it be said he was not, I deny the position and demand the proof.

3. "And we verily believe, that if our episcopacy should at any time, through *tyrannical* or immoral conduct, come under the severe censure of the general conference, the members thereof would see it highly for the glory of God, to preserve the present form, and only change the men." "The members of the general conference" might, perhaps, "change the men," if they were not equally *interested* in playing the *tyrant*. Witness the recent persecutions and expulsions in Baltimore and elsewhere; and the approval of these shameful and "*tyrannical*" proceedings by the bishops and the general conference.

4. "The bishops of the Methodist episcopal church, have *no control whatever* over the decisions of either a general or an annual conference." Def. p. 64. I really wonder Mr. E. was not ashamed to make this assertion, considering the proceedings at the Winchester conference, in which J. Soule and J. Emory took such a "*spirited*" part. The following extract is taken from Mr. E's pamphlet, and flatly contradicts the above assertion. "That a brother but *just elected* to the episcopal office, and *not yet ordained*, or even an existing bishop in fact, whatever regard we might feel for them personally, should thus, by a *strong hand arrest* the operation of resolutions such as the above, *passed* after long and solemn debate upon their subject matter,—*passed* with an express view to conciliation, and concurred in, not only by more than two thirds of the *general conference*, but by *two thirds of the episcopacy itself!! &c.*" When Mr. E. wrote his pamphlet he was opposed to the power of the bishops: when he

wrote his "Defence of our Fathers" he was a *book agent*, and had received a few votes for the office of a bishop. "God forbid that men should not learn while they live, but it is a bad sign when *illumination* and *preferment* come together."



SECTION XIII.—*Title Bishop.*

IF reiteration and confident assertion will do any thing for Methodist episcopacy, it will be under great obligations to Mr. E. For, although so much had been said upon the subject matter of this section, in the preceding part of his book; yet the "title bishop" must be honoured with one whole section for its special use. Its hallowed claims must not be polluted by being mixed or confounded with other topics, nor its honours be lost, or buried in a crowd. And, after thus signalizing it, by such marks of respect, what is there in the whole section worth noticing? Nothing that makes for Methodist episcopacy; but something that justifies the view I have taken of that subject. To begin with the definition of a "bishop."

1. It is a very singular fact, though it cannot be considered as a proof of logical acumen, that the first definition in Mr. E's book is to be found in the first paragraph of this section: and even this is not his own. We are indebted for it to the quotation which he gives from Leigh's *Critica Sacra*. The reader may remember, that I complained, more than once, that Mr. E. did not define the subjects in dispute; and accounted for his neglect on this principle, "that *definition* would be *destruction* to his cause." That the reader may not think that this extract from "Leigh," clashes with what I said formerly, when complaining of his neglect to define his subjects, it may be necessary to remind him, that I said Mr. E. no where defines, what he calls "our episcopacy," nor tells us to what *order* a *Methodist bishop* belongs. In this section we are told, in general terms, what a bishop is, viz. "an overseer:" and farther, that "between bishop and presbyter there is, nevertheless, this difference, presbyter is the name of an *order*,—bishop is the name of an *office* in that *order*." To this definition I subscribe, for it corresponds precisely with my views. Will Mr. E. subscribe to it also? Does it correspond with his views? To these questions let him give a categorical answer, Yes or No. If they are not his sentiments, why quote the definition, unless it be to prove it erroneous? If they are his sentiments, why represent a bishop as of the *third order*, and the Methodist episcopal church as having "*three orders*?" This is another instance of his disingenuousness. Will Mr. E. say, that the "title bishop" in the Methodist episcopal church signifies only "the name of an *office*," and not the name of an "*order*?" Will he say that a

Methodist bishop is of the same "order" that all the elders or presbyters in that church, are, whether they be local or traveling elders? He will not. For his book was written to prove the contrary. Such a statement, as the parity of bishops and presbyters, would not accord with the claims he sets up for those bishops. It would not accord with what he has said respecting the abridgement of the prayer book, and the offices for ordination. It would not accord with the views of the bishops themselves, respecting their dignity, prerogative, pre-eminence, order. It would not accord with Mr. Asbury's sentiments, that a bishop is a distinct order from and superior to a presbyter. Mr. E. knows all this, and yet he quotes an author who says, "Presbyter is the name of *an order*, bishop is the name of an *office* in *that order*" as if he would apply the quotation to a *Methodist* bishop!!

2. To make the distinction respecting bishop and presbyter, or *office* and *order* plain to my Methodist readers, let me suppose that in one of our large towns or cities there are four or five elders or presbyters stationed for one year. The man, whose name stands first on the appointment, is denominated the preacher in charge; because he has the charge of the station. This man is the pastor, overseer, or bishop of the congregations, which he is appointed to serve: and it is in this sense, and in this only, as having oversight of the congregation, that Dr. Miller, a Presbyterian, could say, "In the form of government of the Presbyterian church the *pastors* of churches are expressly styled *bishops*." Def. p. 50. So also said Mr. Wesley. "A *Bishop*—or pastor of a congregation." 1. Tim. 3 ch. 2 ver. See also Moore's life of Wesley, vol. 2. p. 283. The *pastor* is called a *bishop*, because he is the *overseer* of the congregation. Mr. E's quotation, from Dr. Miller's letters, to show the connexion between what Mr. Wesley says in his oburgatory letter to Mr. Asbury, respecting the presbyterians, and what Mr. Wesley says respecting putting away the title of bishop, is extremely disingenuous. Surely Dr. Miller could not mean, that a bishop is a minister of the *third order*, a sentiment which Mr. Asbury held when he assumed the title of bishop, and to which Mr. Wesley was strongly opposed. The preacher in charge among the Methodists is of the *same order* as the rest of the elders, in the same station and yet he is by virtue of his *office*, pastor, overseer or bishop of that charge. He is not called a bishop, it is true; that title being applied to another *order* of men. If the title bishop, in the Methodist episcopal church, means either the preacher in charge, or a man in elder's orders, I never knew it before.

3. I hesitated, for some time, whether I would notice Mr. E's remarks respecting Mr. Wesley's being elected to the "episcopal office," considering these remarks to be so futile, that every

one would, at a glance, perceive their absurdity. Lest, however, they should be considered by some drowning men, who would catch at a straw, sound and unanswerable, I have concluded to insert them, and bestow on them one or two remarks. "Mr. McCaine reproaches our fathers with entering Mr. Wesley's name on the minutes of 1789 as a bishop, after it was known, that the very term was so extremely offensive to him. *This is not correct.* They did enter him as exercising the episcopal office. But they did not entitle him bishop." Def. p. 68. Now what is this but a poor pitiful quibble, as destitute of honesty as it is of common sense. And if Methodist episcopacy is to be defended and supported by such means, I would say of it, "my soul come not thou into their secret; unto their assembly mine honour be not thou united." For to say nothing of the "principles of verballity," which are so offensive to Mr. E. any intelligent school-boy of 10 or 12 years of age can tell him, that the "episcopal office" is the office of a bishop; and that the person discharging the duties of that office, is called a bishop. To deny that Mr Wesley was a bishop, merely because he was only entered "as exercising the episcopal office," is to deny that Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury were bishops, for they were entered in the same way, in the same answer. If, therefore, it was necessary to constitute Mr. Wesley a bishop, to enter him by that title, it was equally necessary to enter Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury by that title, to constitute them bishops. And as the term *bishop* does not appear on the minutes for 11 years, namely, from the year 1789 to the year 1800, and as Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury were considered, in all that time, "bishops," notwithstanding they were only entered "as exercising the episcopal office," in like manner, must Mr. Wesley be considered a bishop, although he was only entered "as exercising the episcopal office."



SECTION XIV.—*Organization of the Methodist episcopal church.*

I HAD occasion to remark, that the two preceding sections of Mr E's book, contain but little that had not been interspersed in other parts of his work. The same thing may be said of this section also. Perhaps he thought, that as he had undertaken to write a book, it would not look like being a "*Defence of our Fathers*" unless it were respectable for *size*. Or, he may have thought, that it would not be considered an ample refutation of the "*History and Mystery of Methodist Episcopacy*," if it did not contain a few pages more than that work. Or, he may have thought, that there are some men in the Methodist episcopal church weak enough to judge of the merits of his book, and the weight of his arguments, by the number of his pages; and that these would certainly pronounce the "*Defence*

of our Fathers" a masterly and unanswerable production, if it were only a little larger than my pamphlet. To swell the work, therefore, it became necessary to *repeat*. For notwithstanding all the advantages he possessed, having nearly the whole connexion on his side :—all the assistance he could procure from the bishops :—all the aid he could obtain from Doctors in Divinity and Masters of Arts :—all the information he could collect from records and documents, from the letters of the living and the papers of the dead, it seems that he could not write a pamphlet in a neat, condensed, logical, and methodical manner : but has compounded and confounded, affirmed and repeated, until his book has grown to the number of ninety-two pages. Although, according to my plan of answering his book, I am obliged to follow him through his sections ; yet I shall not imitate him, in this species of amplification. I shall confine myself to those parts of this section which have not been previously noticed, or such as are in my opinion deserving of remark.

I have already declared it to be my settled opinion, "that every church has a right, not only to choose for herself a particular form of government, at the commencement of her existence, but to alter, change, or amend it, after it has been adopted." The Methodist societies, which had an existence in 1784, possessed the right to adopt any form of government, the episcopal, the presbyterian, the congregational, or any other, which at that period they might have thought proper to adopt. On this point there is, I suppose, no dispute. The point in dispute is this : Had the travelling preachers *alone*, the right to form themselves into a church, adopt the episcopal form of government for the societies, and assume the title of the Methodist episcopal church ; not only without the knowledge, approbation or consent of those societies, but against their views and wishes. For Dr. Coke tells the bishop of London, that "our numerous societies, in America, would have been a regular presbyterian church," were it not that he had taken steps to prevent it. That the travelling preachers had no right to choose a form of government for the societies without their concurrence or approbation, I affirm : much less had they a right to form one, to which the societies were opposed. And here I will adopt Mr. E's own reasoning and language in his "Report" on the petitions and memorials to the late general conference. If the preachers had this right, "it must be either a natural, or acquired right. If a natural right, then, being founded in nature, it must be common to men, as men." According to this reasoning, if the preachers "as men," had "a natural right" to choose for themselves what form of government they pleased ; the members "as men" had "a natural right," to choose a form of government for themselves likewise. Nay, the members had as good a right to choose a form of government for the preach-

ers, as the preachers had to choose one for the members. "If it be alleged to be an acquired right, then it must have been acquired either in consequence of becoming Christians, or of becoming Methodists. If the former, it devolves on" those Methodist preachers or their advocates, who may assert that the preachers in 1784, had a right to choose the episcopal form of government for the societies "to prove, that this right is conferred by the Holy Scriptures : and it is also binding on them to prove that the Scriptures impose on" the members, "the corresponding obligation to grant the claim" The Holy Scriptures gave no authority to Methodist preachers, to adopt the episcopal form of government for the Methodist societies, when the church was organized ; of course no right can be proved from them. "Or if the latter be alleged, viz. that it has been acquired in consequence of becoming Methodists, then it must have been, either by some conventional compact, or by some obligatory principle, in the economy of Methodism, to which, as *then organized*, the claimants voluntarily attached themselves. "That the preachers derived a right to adopt the episcopal form of government from any "conventional compact," no one will affirm ; for no such "compact" was ever made. Indeed, the societies were not even consulted, much less "a conventional compact" entered into. That the preachers did not derive a right from any "obligatory principle in the economy of Methodism," is equally evident. For it was the peculiar glory of Methodism, "*as then organized*," to receive into its societies, "all who had a desire to flee the wrath to come." If any were expelled from the fellowship of the Methodists, they were not thereby excommunicated from their own churches. Expulsion from the one, did not imply expulsion from the other. These were "the principles of Methodism as then organized," and from these principles, the travelling preachers derived no right to organize the church and adopt the episcopal form of government for the societies, without their consent.

Having admitted and maintained the right of the societies to choose any form of government they pleased, I will now offer my objections to the episcopal form being adopted for them. 1. It was adopted by the preachers *alone*, without consulting the societies, or obtaining their concurrence or approbation : a thing having no precedent in the Christian world from the days of the Apostles to the present time. 2. If the societies had been consulted, they would not have chosen the *episcopal*, but the *presbyterian* form, as appears from the testimony of Dr. Coke : "our numerous societies, in America. would have been a regular presbyterian church, if it had not been for myself" &c. 3. To give the episcopal form of government currency with the people, and to reconcile them to the adoption of a form, for which they had no partialities, but to which they were opposed, ad-

vantage was taken of the great respect the societies had for the name and character of Mr. Wesley. It was, therefore, published, that this form of government was "recommended" by him; and that it was adopted in consequence of his "counsel" and advice. These things, will be a sufficient answer to Mr. E's question, "on what ground is the Methodist episcopacy thus instituted *illegitimate*, unlawful?" Def. p. 70. It is unlawful, 1. Because the preachers had no right, no authority "from the Holy Scriptures—from a conventional compact—or from the principles of Methodism, as then organized" to adopt the episcopal form of government. 2. Because, it rendered the people's rights a nullity; or in other words, the people were treated as if they had no right to say one word in the organization of the church, or the adoption of the form of government. 3. Because Mr. Wesley's recommendation was offered as authority for it, which recommendation was never given. And 4. because it was imposed upon the societies under the sanction of Mr. Wesley's name.

Mr. E. seems to think that if Mr. Asbury had been influenced 'by motives of ambition and self-aggrandizement,' it would have been "easy" for him, "to have organized a church in America, with himself at its head, independently of Mr. Wesley, and of the whole European connexion." Def. p. 69. I think not: for in that case, he must have renounced his principles; or, he must have had a church without the ordinances,—a mere faction, not a church: a church being "a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the *sacraments* duly administered according to Christ's ordinance" See XIII. Article of Religion. Mr. Asbury had been brought up in the church of England; and there is no evidence that he ever changed his sentiments respecting the doctrines, or government of that church. It has been shewn already, that instead of changing, he retained them: and that he differed from Mr. Wesley respecting the order of bishops, affirming it was distinct from and superior to the *order* of presbyters. If Mr. Asbury did not hold the doctrine of "apostolical succession," he, all along acted on the principle, that ordination by those, who themselves had been ordained, according to common, ecclesiastical usage, was necessary to the valid administration of the ordinances. On this ground he resisted the proceedings of the preachers in Virginia, who, in 1778, acting under the "exigence of necessity," chose three of their own body, and ordained them. On the same ground, he was unremitting in his exertions to prevail on them to suspend the administration of the ordinances. On the same ground also, he afterwards voted with the Philadelphia conference, that the aforesaid ordinations of the Virginia preachers, and all the proceedings, connected therewith, were "*invalid*." "To have organized a church, what plausible pretext or occasion did he want," says Mr. E. I reply, he wanted *ordination*; a proper, re-

gular, ecclesiastical ordination, such a one as accorded with his own views. Without such an ordination, he could not move an inch. And where could he have obtained it? The Protestant episcopal church in the United States, was not at that time organized. Her ministers had not ordination for themselves; consequently could not have given it to others. Such an ordination as any other religious denomination could have imparted, admitting they were willing, Mr. Asbury would not have accepted, because inconsistent with his principles. He knew, therefore, it would be vain to expect ordination from any other quarter than from Mr. Wesley; and accordingly, in the hope of obtaining it from him, he waited patiently many years. Now will Mr. E. answer one question: Why did Mr. Asbury remain in connexion with Mr. Wesley for 13 years after he arrived in this country, resisting the importunities of the people for the ordinances—opposing the proceedings and ordinations of the preachers in Virginia, “some of whom, were the ablest and most influential men in connexion, and some of whom were his most intimate, and personal friends;” and yet in two years after he had obtained ordination from Mr. Wesley, he refused to submit to his authority, and struck his name from the American minutes? If there was no “ambition and self-aggrandizement” in this, there was something, which, to me at least, looks very much like it.



SECTION XV.—*Leaving Mr. Wesley's name off the Minutes.*

“The meaning of this phrase,” says Mr. E. “seems not to have been *correctly understood*” (*non mi recordi* again). “In some places Mr. M'Caine asserts, that Mr. Wesley's name was left off in 1785—in other places he represents this event as having taken place in 1787. The confusion was in Mr. M'Caine's own mind, not in the subject. Def. p. 73. In a note on the 49th page, Mr. E. advances the same sentiment. And on page 81, he says “Mr. M'Caine asserts also, that the minutes of conference *were altered*, to make them quadrate with subsequent proceedings.” In proof of this, and showing the application to Mr. Asbury, he refers to Lee's History. Now Mr. Lee says, “In the course of this year (1787) Mr. Asbury re-printed the general minutes, but in a *different form*, from what they were before.”

I have collected and placed together, in one paragraph, all that Mr. E. has said respecting leaving Mr. Wesley's name off the minutes, that the reader may judge, whether what I have said on this subject, and on the alteration of the minutes, be correct or not. Before I proceed to the proof of these facts, it may be proper to inform him, that “the minutes of conference” of which I speak, and which I have examined, is a bound volume, purporting to contain “Minutes of the Methodist conferences

annually held in America from 1773 to 1813 inclusive, Vol. I. New-York, published by Daniel Hitt and Thomas Ware, for the Methodist connexion in the United States. John C. Totten, printer. 1813." This volume is easily obtained, and the reader is requested to examine it, for himself.

Adverting to the leaving of Mr. Wesley's name off the minutes, I said in my pamphlet, "We know it to be a *fact*, that Mr. Wesley's name was left out of the minutes of conference; and many of our old friends are acquainted with this fact, as well as ourselves. But how many are acquainted with all the circumstances of the case? We presume but very few. We are free to acknowledge, *we are not*." His. & Mys. p. 36. First. From this statement it is evident, that I did not fix the date at all. I neither affirmed it was '85, nor '87. When I mentioned the fact, I did not, myself, determine the period when his name was left off. I only mentioned it with reference to the records of the church, or to other authorities. Secondly. In order to come at the knowledge of the date of a fact, of which I professed my ignorance, I examined the above book of minutes, but could not find Mr. Wesley's name on them from 1784 until 1789. Thirdly. Notwithstanding Mr. Wesley's name does not appear in the minutes from 1784 until 1789, I argued it must have been on the minutes for 1785, when those minutes *were taken*. For this opinion I assigned the following reasons, two of which Mr. E. has not noticed. "1. Because, it seems strange, if not unreasonable, that the conference would give Mr. Wesley's name as the *only authority* for the adoption of the episcopal form of government, and at the very same conference determine to reject him. 2. Because, in quoting Mr. Wesley's letter in the above 'account,' that part of it which relates to the liturgy, is omitted. That there was no resolution passed at that conference to suppress that part of his letter, we argue from the fact, that the prayer book, which had been abridged and recommended by Mr. Wesley, was used by the superintendents and many of the preachers subsequently to the conference of 1784: and we cannot believe, that they would do a thing, the authority for doing which, they had previously and formally rejected. 3. Because we have the testimony of the Rev. Jesse Lee to prove, that the minutes of conference *were altered*! In the course of this year 1787, Mr. Asbury re-printed the general minutes, but in a different form from what they were before." History and Mystery, pp. 37. 38. Fourthly. Finding I could not ascertain from the minutes, when his name was left off, I inquired of several old members, if they could tell me. But not obtaining the desired information from them, I wrote to the five bishops: also to six of the oldest preachers in the connexion. See the fourth question in my circular letters. The Rev. Freeborn Garrettson in his answer, to my letter said, "I think it was done at a conference held in May 1787."

This is one of the dates, which, Mr. E. says, *I gave*. I only averred it to be a fact, that Mr. Wesley's name was on the minutes of 1785 and 1786 *when these minutes were taken*. That according to Mr. Garrettson's letter, his name was left off in 1787. That when the minutes of '85 and 86' *were taken* Mr. Wesley's name was on them, but when the same minutes *were printed*, his name was left off. Where now is the confusion? In my "mind," or in the records of the church? I am fully sustained in the statement, "that the minutes of conference were altered to make them quadrate with subsequent proceedings." I therefore reiterate the assertion in the face of the world, and I challenge Mr. E. or any other person to disprove what I say, **THE RECORDS OF THE CHURCH HAVE BEEN ALTERED**. The omission of Mr. Wesley's name in the printed minutes of conference for 1785 and 1786 is one proof; but it is not the only one.

2. The minutes of conference for 1785, printed in the bound volume referred to above, furnish *prima facie* evidence, that they were not taken at the time the conference was held in that year. In these printed minutes, the *past time* is used instead of the *present*, in every instance, thus: "*It was agreed*"—"circumstances *made*"—"At this conference *we formed*"—"we *thought* it best," &c. In the original minutes it reads thus: "*We will form ourselves into an episcopal church*" &c. Besides, the word "bishop" is inserted in the bound minutes of 1785, and it is now well known, that that term was not used until 1787.

3. Mr. Wesley's circular letter, dated "Bristol Sep. 10. 1784" was not inserted in the minutes of 1785 when these minutes were taken. This statement I make to the best of my recollection, not having it in my power to examine these minutes now. The only copy of these minutes which I ever saw, was bound up in the prayer book of 1786; and if Mr. E. cannot procure a copy of that prayer book, nearer than Baltimore, he can, I believe, obtain one from his friend Dr. Bond. This prayer book is very scarce; for although I have been in 16 states of the Union, and have been in the houses of many old Methodists, I never saw a copy of this prayer book, but one. As soon as I had returned it to the owner, I was informed that Dr. Bond had bought it up. But alas! for him and Methodist episcopacy, he was a day too late. I believe Mr. Wesley's circular letter of the above date is not in the minutes of 1785, which were inserted in the prayer book of '86; and yet that letter will be found in the minutes for '85 printed for the American connexion. Here, then, if my recollection is correct, is another proof, that the records of the church have been altered, by inserting this letter in the book of *printed minutes*, when it was not inserted in the minutes *when taken*. This same letter is said to contain all the "reasons" for becoming a "separate body under the denomination of the Methodist episcopal church;" and yet there is no reference made to those "rea-

sons," in the minutes printed in the prayer book of '86, but other "reasons" are assigned for that measure. Nor is this all. When this letter was printed it was *mutilated*, part of it having been *expunged*.

4. The minutes of conference, which were taken when the church was organized, "were first printed," says Mr. E. "in Philadelphia by Charles Cist in 1785." Def. p. 41. They were afterwards re-printed with the prayer book in "London, by Frys and Couchman." These minutes are headed as follows. "The general minutes of the conferences of the Methodist episcopal church in America, forming the constitution of the said church." These minutes contain *seventy-six* questions with their answers, and occupy a space of *thirty-three* pages. Now, any one, who will take the pains to look into the book of minutes, printed for the Methodist episcopal church, cannot find one single question or answer, in them, which was printed in the minutes bound up in the prayer book. No, nor one single line. I had occasion to notice, before, the construction and operation of Mr. E's "*magical mill*," but really here is something worse than *his mill*. He did give us a page and a half, after grinding down 44 pages of Drew's Life of Coke. But in the bound minutes we have not a single page, nor a single question, nor a single answer, nor a single line of the minutes of conference of '85 which were published in the prayer book. Here is a fourth proof that *the records of the church have been altered*. And for what purpose were they altered? I answer again, "to make them quadrate with subsequent proceedings."

To weaken the force of Mr. Lee's testimony produced above, Mr. E. quotes another passage from his (Mr. Lee) book, which, by the unwary reader, might be considered as relating to the same subject. "The form of the annual minutes was changed this year, 1779, in a few points, and the first question stands thus, who are admitted on trial? The first question used to be, who are admitted into connexion? It is evident, therefore, that Mr. Lee had reference simply to the form in which the minutes were methodised and printed." Def. p. 81. *Note*. In this place, he had reference to the *form*. But it is not "evident" to me, that he had, in the quotation, I gave from him formerly. For Mr. Lee had too much good sense, and too much honesty to say, in reply to the assertion that the records of the church were altered, that this alteration consisted, in a mere transposition in the order of the questions. Nor will the quotation in the above note p. 81 invalidate the testimony I adduced from Mr. Lee's History in support of the alteration of the records of the church. For in Mr. E's quotation, Mr. Lee speaks of a change which was made in 1779. In the quotation which I gave above, Mr. Lee speaks of Mr. Asbury's re-printing "the general minutes in a different form from what they were before." The reader will please to

notice that this latter alteration which is the one to which I referred was made in 1787. And the one which Mr. E. gives, was made in 1779. See the dates, and then say was not Mr. E. cunning. It is not of the *folding* of the *paper*, or *form* of the *instrument* of writing, but of the *matter* or *contents*, that an honest man speaks when he says, the record, or document was altered. Neither was it of the *form* or *arrangement* of the questions in the minutes I spoke, when I affirmed "the records of the church have been altered."

I have now incontestibly established the two points with which I commenced, namely, that Mr. Wesley's name was left off the minutes, and that the records of the church have been altered. How the omission of his name was viewed by Mr. Wesley, we learn from Mr. Asbury himself. Alluding to the minutes of '85 in which the conference declared themselves "ready in matters belonging to church government to obey his (Mr. Wesley's) commands," Mr. Asbury says in his Journals, "it is true, *I never approved of that binding minute*. I did not think it practical expediency to obey Mr. Wesley at three thousand miles distance, in all matters relating to church government; neither did brother Whatcoat, nor several others. At the first general conference I was *mute* and *modest* when it passed, and I was *mute* when it was expunged. For this Mr. Wesley blamed me, and was displeased that I did not rather reject the whole connexion, or leave them if they did not comply."

We shall now see what was Dr. Coke's opinion respecting this transaction, which Mr. E. palliates with a cold phlegmatic acknowledgment, "that a *gentler*, and *more conciliatory* course, on the part of the conference, in relation to Mr. Wesley, personally, might have been, perhaps, the more excellent way." How this sentence drags!

"The line, too, labours, and the words move slow."

No wonder, when disapprobation is expressed of any part of Mr. Asbury's conduct: for he is the only one in Mr. E's book that has not been censured, and even this is accompanied with a "perhaps" as if it came from a *friend*! But there would be no "perhaps" in the case, if the New York conference were to serve Mr. E. as Mr. Wesley was served. But to return to Dr. Coke. He said, in the sermon he preached in Baltimore on the occasion of Mr. Wesley's death, "that the leaving of Mr. Wesley's name off the minutes was an almost *diabolical* act. No history furnished any parallel to it—that a body of Christian ministers should treat an aged and faithful minister, as Mr. Wesley undoubtedly was, with such disrespect." In his circular, dated Wilmington, Delaware, May 4th, 1791. he says, "I doubt much, whether the cruel usage he received in Baltimore in 1787, when he was excommunicated,

(wonderful and most unparalleled step) did not *hasten his death*. Indeed *I little doubt it*. For from the time he was informed of it, he began to hang down his head, and to think he had lived long enough" ✓✓

Mr. E. thinks "it was not understood, or intended from the commencement of the organization of our church, that Mr. Wesley should personally appoint our church officers." For this opinion he offers as proof, that Mr. Wesley retained the form of ordination of superintendents in the prayer book, which form prescribes "the imposition of hands upon the head of the *elected person*." That Mr. Wesley did not understand this business in the light in which Mr. E. represents it is undeniable; for he *did appoint* Mr. Whatcoat joint superintendent with Mr. Asbury, as may be seen by his letter to Dr. Coke on that subject. 2. Mr. Wesley never did, and never would give up the appointment of church officers, especially those who held the first rank in the Methodist societies. 3. He was displeased that even *election* was resorted to by the general conference, in the case of Mr. Asbury to the superintendency. And this, by the way, may serve as another proof, in addition to those I have already offered, that in recommending the liturgy, he neither recommended a third order of ministers, nor the episcopal form of church government.



SECTION XVI.—*Mr. M'Caine's Arithmetical Calculation.*

IN my History and Mystery I stated that "Methodist episcopacy, from its commencement, had a tendency to create dissensions and divisions among the bishops and travelling preachers, as well as among the societies." p. 62. In proof of this assertion, I noticed the rupture which took place between Dr. Coke and the conference in 1787.—"The dissatisfaction in our connexion in general, and among the travelling preachers in particular," in consequence of the "proceedings of the council" in 1789. The appeal of Mr. O'Kelly in 1792, besides *other secessions*, which took place in different parts of the United States. As the secession which had its origin in the rejection of "Mr. O'Kelly's appeal" was the most extensive, and most generally known. when treating of it I said "*this appeal*," &c. Not that I intended that the rejection of Mr. O'Kelly's appeal, and that alone, abstract from all other things, was the cause of a decrease of 20,000. I well knew, for I was on the spot at the time, that Mr. Hammett's secession had taken place in 1791, and this secession I intended should be embraced in the account also. It would, therefore, have been more accurate, if in accounting for the decrease, instead of saying "*this appeal*," I had said, the opposition to *episcopacy*, (and

this was the very thing with which I commenced the section,) and episcopal prerogative was, about that time so violent "that in five years, the minutes of conference exhibit a decrease of 20,000 members."

Mr. E. says, "Now how will he make this out?" I will tell him. At the end of the bound volume of minutes, there is a "general recapitulation" of the number of preachers in the travelling connexion—the number of preachers who died in the work—and the number of members in society each year, from the first conference in 1773 down to the year 1813 inclusive. In this volume, are bound together, all the minutes of the church; and from this table at the end of the volume. I took my account. I now put it to the candor of every man to say, what reason had I to distrust the report of those minutes? Had I any reason to believe that they were less correct than any other document to which I might have recourse? But Mr. E. says, "in the aggregate, as exhibited in the minutes, did Mr. M'Caine discover no mistake?" No, I did not; for I went no farther than this table. I looked at no other account than this "general recapitulation." He says. I ought to have looked into Lee's History. Had I quoted from Lee, Mr. E. perhaps, would have replied, your authority is not *official*. Why do you not go to the minutes of conference? To the minutes I went, and to them I confined myself. And in examining them, was it to be expected, that I would add up every line of figures to ascertain the true number, when that was done already to my hand? And, even if I had done so, and detected an error, as I might suppose, how was I to determine, whether the error existed in the minutes for the respective year, or in the table of "general recapitulation?" The one was as likely to be wrong as the other. And even now, notwithstanding I have added up the lines of figures, in the minutes for 1791, I do not get the same result with that in the minutes. The fact is, that in looking at the "general recapitulation," I found the number for 1791 to be 76,153. Five years afterwards, namely in 1796, the number inserted is 56,664. Confining myself, therefore, to this table, I had as good reason to believe the latter number was incorrect as I had that the former was; but I supposed, as I went to no other account, that both numbers were correct. If Mr. E. can subtract these two numbers 56,664 from 76,153 he will find the difference to be 19,489, which for the sake of round numbers, I set down as 20,000, and said, it was "*about* the one third of the whole number in connexion." If the above numbers are not correct, am I answerable for the mistake? If the book agents publish erroneous accounts, how am I to find means to detect them. I have taken the statements hitherto which have come from the book room as true and correct; but if I am pardoned in this thing, I will promise to receive no account hereafter as *true*, merely

Because it comes from that quarter, notwithstanding it may have Mr. E. at its head

“But we have other cases of arithmetical logic,” says Mr. E. to “propose in bar of Mr. M'Caine's.” Mr. E's first argument, in favour of “our episcopal form of government,” is founded on the *increase* of numbers. If this can be called an argument, it is a weak and a stale one. “In bar” of all that can be said on that subject, the reader is requested to turn to the first volume of the “Mutual Rights” and he will find an argument in favour of representation from the laity, and consequently against “our episcopal form of government” as 12½ are to 1½. But suppose Mr. E's “logic” was sound, what right has *he* to use it? He has been in the itinerant connexion for 18 years: how many have been added to the society through *his* instrumentality, in all that time? Although he writes so feelingly in praise of Mr. Asbury's toils, and sufferings, and travels, and labours, yet it may be asked how many *hard circuits* has *he* travelled? What sufferings has *he* endured? His ministerial services are estimated, perhaps, as highly by himself as by others, but how many have been awakened and converted by *his* ministry, is not for me to say;—the great day of eternity will disclose the number.



SECTION XVII.—*The Address to General Washington.*

“LET no one blame an historian,” says an elegant writer, “who does not begin before his records; it is not his fault, it is his virtue.” Nor ought the historian to be blamed, who confines himself to his records, unless he has undoubted evidence that his records are not true. In writing my “History and Mystery,” I was governed by these principles, not only not “to begin before my records,” but to confine myself to the accredited records of the church, and to give those records as authority for the facts I stated. Of the class of records which I considered as worthy of belief, was the life of Dr. Coke, written by Mr. Drew. This work I considered entitled to full credit. First, on account of the standing and reputation of the author as a writer. Secondly, because it was “printed in London at the conference room, sold by Thomas Blanchard, 14 City Road, and at the Methodist preaching houses in town and country.” Thirdly, because it was re-printed by the Methodist episcopal church, and sold by the preachers in the United States. Of the many facts contained in my pamphlet, the account of one is taken from this work, namely, that before Dr. Coke left the United States in 1785, an address was drawn up by him and Mr. Asbury, which address was presented by

them to general Washington.—That this address was published in the newspapers in this country, and in them found its way to England, before Dr. Coke arrived there.—That upon the doctor's arrival in England, charges were preferred against him, before the conference.—And finally, as a punishment, it was determined that his name should be left off the minutes of conference "the succeeding year."

The reader is particularly requested to bear in mind, that I derived every particle of this information from Drew's life of Coke; and in copying the account into my book, I gave, not only the page, but was so particular as to notice the *edition* of the work. Now, what does Mr. E. with all his boasted light and information say respecting the whole affair? Does he deny that such an address had been drawn up by Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury? Does he deny that such an address had been presented in 1785? Does he deny that this address had been published in the newspapers? Does he deny that the newspapers containing it had reached England before the doctor? Does he deny that charges predicated upon this address had been preferred against the doctor in the British conference? Does he deny that the doctor was punished by leaving his name off the minutes? He does not. He admits all these facts, by inserting the very same account in the "Defence of our Fathers;" and contents himself with saying. "Mr. Drew though himself a British subject, has vindicated both the conduct and motives of Dr. Coke, on that occasion, with a triumphant ability, which leaves us nothing to add." Def p. 60.

But Mr. E. intimates that the address to Washington was not presented in 1785. but in 1789. And yet all the transactions coupled with this address, actually took place according to Mr. Drew's statement, and I might add Mr. E's also, in 1785. Either the whole account, as given by Mr. Drew and copied by Mr. E. is incorrect; or there was an address presented in 1785. If there was no address presented in '85, it seems very strange that Mr. Drew, with all Dr. Coke's papers before him should say there was; and that his statement should be supported by collateral testimony. Allowing that no address was presented in that year, as Mr. Sparks, in his letter, intimates to be the case, then the charges which were preferred against the doctor, and the subsequent punishment, must have originated in another matter; and what more likely to have elicited charges than the organization of the Methodist episcopal church, and the assumption of that title. I say, therefore, upon a review of the whole affair, that this address is involved in "mystery;" and it remains for Mr. E. to clear this mystery up.

It may be expected that I should state the exertions I made to obtain information respecting the *date* of this address, which is said by Mr. Drew, to have been presented to general Wash-

ington in 1785: and the reasons which led me to conclude it was dated in 1785, and not in 1789. The reader must bear in mind, that although the address itself is not given by Mr. Drew, nor any date assigned to it, yet he says expressly that an address had been drawn up and presented to general Washington, by Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury before the doctor left the United States in 1785. That it was published in the newspapers, carried to England, preferred as a charge against the doctor, in the conference, and for it, his name was left off the minutes as a punishment. All these things are stated by Mr. Drew, and in the contemplation of these facts, I considered first, the character of Mr. Drew. Some of my readers may not know that this gentleman is a local preacher in the Methodist connexion in England. That he is the author of two works which have immortalized his name : one on the "Immateriality and Immortality of the Soul," the other on the "Resurrection of the Body." That as a close thinker he is considered to have but few to equal, none to surpass him. That this gentleman was selected, by Dr. Coke to write his life, and for this purpose, the doctor placed in his hands all his papers, before he sailed for India. Now, what was there in the *historian* to lead me to disbelieve his statements? I could not doubt of his *ability* to investigate the subject; his metaphysical works forbade that thought. I could not doubt of his *integrity*; his ministerial standing, and his high character for piety precluded that. I could not doubt of the *correctness* of his statements; I knew that he had all Dr. Coke's papers in his possession, and before his eyes. Viewing the subject therefore, with reference to the *writer*, and the *materials* which were in his possession, I had no more reason to question his statement, than I would have to disbelieve any statement in the Life of Washington, by Judge Marshall; or in the Life of Patrick Henry, by Mr. Wirt.

Secondly. I stated above, that although Mr. Drew did not insert a copy of the address which had been presented to general Washington, before the doctor left the United States in 1785: yet he inserted a copy of general Washington's answer, which was said to be an answer to that same address. The answer being given, presupposed the presentment of the address, to which it purports to be an answer. This answer, though it has no date, corresponds word for word (with the exception of *one word*) with the answer published in the Arminian Magazine, vol. 1, p. 286. I concluded therefore, that as Mr. Drew had all Dr. Coke's papers before his eyes, that the address published in the Arminian Magazine must have been the address to which he referred; the answer in the Magazine being the same as that which he published in his life of Dr. Coke.

Thirdly. It will be recollected that Mr. Drew distinctly states that charges had been preferred against the doctor upon his return to England, founded upon the address which he and

Mr. Ashbury presented to general Washington. He farther tells us, "that as some decisive steps were necessary to be taken in this critical affair, it was finally determined that the name of Dr. Coke should be omitted, in the minutes for the *succeeding year*." I accordingly looked in the British minutes for 1786, the year succeeding '85, and could not find Dr. Coke's name in them that year. Here was collateral proof that Mr. Drew was correct in his statement.

Fourthly. As Mr. Drew affirmed that this address was published in the newspapers of the day, and as general Washington's residence was in the neighbourhood of Alexandria, D. C. I thought it was most likely that the newspapers in which the address was published, were those of Alexandria. I accordingly wrote to two gentlemen in the District of Columbia, who are well acquainted with several of the officers of government, and with members of congress, requesting them to use their influence with their acquaintance, as well as to make exertions themselves, to procure for me, if possible, a copy of that address, or inform me in what newspaper it was printed. After a lapse of several weeks, they answered my letters, and stated that they could neither find the address, nor tell me where I could obtain it. One of these gentlemen suggesting that it might probably be found among Washington's papers, I had it in contemplation to go to Mount Vernon with the view of obtaining a sight of it. But being informed that Judge Washington was on his circuit, I relinquished the idea.

Fifthly. Failing to procure a copy of the address, through the assistance of my friends, I next applied to the editors of the Baltimore "American," supposing as it was an old paper, they could give me some information that might serve as a clue to the business. They informed me that they had no papers "so far back," but in all probability I could find them in the Baltimore Library.

Sixthly. I next applied to the librarian in the Baltimore Library, who not only allowed me to search the newspapers in the library, but politely assisted me in making the search. In this way I spent the greater part of a day, but all in vain.

Seventhly. Disappointed in every effort I had made, either to get a copy of the address, or to ascertain its date, I published my pamphlet, under the solemn belief that Mr. Drew's statement was true, and that the date of the address was 1785, and not 1789.

Eighthly. Shortly after my pamphlet came out of press, Mr. Sparks's letters to Judge Story were published in the newspapers: in which he stated that he had obtained general Washington's papers. As soon as I read these letters, I determined to apply to Mr. Sparks, to know if a copy of the address could be procured from him. Being a stranger to Mr. Sparks, I waited

on a gentleman of this city to get a letter of introduction to Mr. Sparks. This gentleman very politely and promptly complied with my wishes. I then addressed a letter to Mr. Sparks, accompanied with one of my pamphlets, and received from him the following answer.

"Sir.

Boston, July 27th, 1827.

It has given me pleasure to comply with your request, in looking over general Washington's papers for the address of doctor Coke and bishop Asbury. The *original* paper I do not find, but the address is recorded with the date of May the *twenty-ninth* 1789. In your pamphlet, the date is stated to be May the nineteenth. A mistake of a figure has, in some way, crept in. As to the year, I am inclined to think the same error has happened; that is, 9 has been altered to 5. It is a little singular, to be sure, that two such errors should have occurred in one date. Whether it admits of explanation, I know not.

General Washington was never president of congress; nor is it probable that any address of a public nature would have been made to him in the year 1785, when he was living at Mount Vernon, as a private citizen. I should think circumstances would be very conclusive against this latter date.

The address and reply as recorded are word for word, as printed in your pamphlet, except one instance in the reply where three words are *omitted*. Thus, instead of—"It shall still be my endeavour to manifest the purity of my inclinations,"—it is expressed in the records as follows—"It shall be my endeavour to manifest, *by overt acts*, the purity of my inclinations." In all other respects the printed copy is an exact transcript.

I am, Sir, very respectfully, your most obedient servant

JARED SPARKS"

From this plain, unvarnished account of the pains I took to ascertain the date of this address, the reader will be able to form an opinion, respecting the justness of the charge, preferred in the following words. "Any former publisher might have overlooked an error in the narrative, as a court in the ordinary routine of business without investigation or argument, or having the attention directed to the points in the case. But Mr. M'Caine's error is that of a court solemnly deliberating, hearing the arguments of counsel, taking time to advise, and then pronouncing a most glaringly unfounded and injurious decision, against all evidence and reason, and all justice and truth." Def. p. 81.

1. The decision which I pronounced, so far from being "against all evidence and reason, and all justice and truth," was pronounced with the utmost respect for the testimony, and with the utmost reliance on the respectability of the witness. The witness was the Rev. Mr. Drew, Dr. Coke's biographer; a gentleman who was selected, by the doctor himself, to write his life; and who placed in Mr. Drew's hands, all his papers for the

purpose. Mr. Drew holds a very distinguished rank in the religious and literary world. He is a minister in the Methodist society in England; the author of two celebrated metaphysical works, and editor of the Imperial Magazine. Was not this gentleman a competent, and credible witness? Would not his testimony be received in any court of justice as soon as Mr. E's? And if I had been so weak or wicked as to pronounce a decision against such testimony, then indeed it might have been said that my decision was "against all evidence and reason, and against all justice and truth." As it is, the imputation returns to Mr. E.

2. It ought also to be known that the Rev. Mr. Drew was deemed a competent and credible witness by the Methodist society in England. His "Life of Dr. Coke" was so highly appreciated, that it was published by the British connexion, and sold by the preachers "in town and country."

3. This work has been re-published in this country at the Methodist book-room. It has been sold by the preachers all over the United States—has been eulogised in the strongest terms possible—and has been lately recommended to the members of the society without even an *index expurgatorius*.

4. From this work, Drew's Life of Coke, I derived every particle of information I possessed at that time upon the subject of the "address," and the punishment inflicted on the doctor for presenting it. In the decision which I pronounced on this matter, I gave Mr. Drew as authority for all I advanced: of course, if there was any "error," it was Mr. Drew's; not mine. This Mr. E. knew well, when he wrote the above charge; as is evident from the fact that he represented the subject in the same point of light, notwithstanding all the pains he took to *manufacture* his quotations.



SECTION XVIII.—*History and Mystery of Mr. M'Caine's inconsistency.*

IF any thing unfair or untrue, coming from Mr. E's pen, could surprise me, I certainly should be surprised at the contents of this section. In reviewing a former section of his work, I perceived he had not once mentioned my name; but he has made ample amends for this omission, by appropriating a whole section to the "history and mystery" of my "inconsistency." He has reserved the history of my alleged "inconsistency" to the last, with a view, I suppose, of making a deeper impression; and this, he thinks, will clinch the nail which he supposed he had so surely driven. But when the reader is made acquainted with the history of the facts, to which Mr. E. has alluded, and which he has distorted and discoloured, the odium which was intended to be fixed on me, will in the end fall upon himself.

When I was printing my "History and Mystery," the printer informed me, there would be two or three spare pages, and

wished me to furnish matter to fill them up. This induced me to sketch the plan, which is given in the "conclusion." In this sketch, I distinctly stated, that the plan was entirely my own; and that it did not emanate from the "brethren who are in favor of representation." I was explicit in making this statement, lest the plan should be objected to as speaking the language of reformers generally, or as being sanctioned by them. One of the articles in this plan runs thus: "Let the name of bishop and the episcopal office, as it now exists among us, be put away for ever," &c. With a view of preventing objections, or weakening them if made, the project was submitted as the production of a single individual. Of one, who was willing to submit to the judgment of the majority of his reforming brethren, if they "thought it best to relinquish any or all of them," for the present. Of one, who arrogated no right to dictate, and who gave an assurance in his statement, that he would co-operate with his reforming brethren in any way, that would be likely to secure the great principle of "Representation." "We hope, therefore," this was my language, "no attempt will be made to withhold representation from the laity on account of any objections which may be made against the specified items of change. We are not tenacious of them. But representation from the local ministry and laity, by the help of God, we will never relinquish. This, with us, is a *sine qua non*."

Perceiving that every word in this quotation contradicted and refuted the slanderous reports put in circulation by some in *high* stations, that I only wanted to be the head of a party, Mr. E. improves upon a suggestion offered by Dr. Bond. The doctor had said of me, "if he believes all that he has written in the previous part of his book, and would be satisfied with *this*, he offers a *base and disgraceful* compromise." *Truth-loving* and *slander-hating* Dr. Bond who is almost afraid to open his mouth, lest an *untruth* or a *slander* should slip out, ushers in his conclusion with an "if;" and modest Dr. Emory (*par nobile fratrum*) asks, "is Mr. M'Caine *sincere*?" Yes, gentlemen, I believed the statements made in my book, and I was "*sincere*" in making them. And although you have both tried your skill, you have not been able to disprove them, or shake their credibility in the least.

Mr. E. asks "Does he really mean, after all he has said, that if admitted into the general conference, he would not be tenacious of doing away the name of bishop, and the episcopal office as it now exists among us? Or does he say this, lest by saying otherwise, at this juncture, he might dash from *his* lips the cup of sweets?"

To this I answer. 1. I was a member of general conferences long before Mr. E. was a member of the church, and never found them to offer "a cup of sweets." 2. Since I have been engaged in the cause of reform, I never had the least wish or desire to be a member of a general conference. 3. The expressions which

he has attempted to distort, and place to the account of my "inconsistency," were not intended to procure for myself "a cup of sweets;" but to prevent objections to the sketch, procure unanimity among reformers, and shew, that notwithstanding I might have my own views of the subject, yet I was willing to submit to the will of the majority. 4. The expression of these sentiments, intended to be applied to the incipient stage of the business, cannot be construed as a pledge, promise or assurance, that at a future period I would be wanting in my exertions to "do away the name of bishop and the episcopal office as it now exists among us." 5 In proposing to put away the name of bishop, and to abolish the episcopal office *as it now exists among us*, I conceived I was only reiterating Mr. Wesley's advice who entreated Mr. Asbury in the most tender manner, and by the most sacred and powerful considerations to put away the title. 6. Perhaps some may *feel* that I have done as much, to say the least, as any other man, to put away the title. They may be fearful that as I had begun, so I intended to go on, until at last, the object of their highest ambition would be prostrated in the dust.

"But a still more extraordinary mystery of inconsistency," says Mr. E. "remains to be developed." To make out this "inconsistency," he compares one of the reasons, which I assigned in the preface to my "History and Mystery," for the publication of that work, with a "communication," which I made "in a way to reach episcopal ears." In the preface, I said, "I think this exposure of the manner in which episcopacy was foisted upon the societies. will tend much to lessen, if it will not totally overcome, the opposition of travelling preachers to *representation*." In the communication which reached episcopal ears, (Mr. E. ought to have said episcopal eyes unless he means that a Methodist bishop *sees* with his *ears* instead of his *eyes*.) I am represented as saying, "affection and veneration for episcopal men might, and no doubt would lead a local representation to support a measure which they had no immediate and direct interest in opposing! Thus, by *exposure* of episcopacy and of episcopal men, Mr. Mc'Caine exerts himself, on one side to overcome the opposition of travelling preachers to the representation of local preachers. And *at the same time*, on the other side, he endeavours to convince episcopal men, that the representation of local preachers will tend to confirm and to perpetuate their prerogative." Had I been guilty of this Double Dealing, and made this "communication *at the same time*," when I made the "exposure" to which reference is made in my preface, I would have been like a *lawyer* whom I once knew, who took a fee from both plaintiff and defendant in the same suit. But when the case came to be tried, this *gentleman* could not play "Jack of both sides" any longer. His iniquitous conduct was detected, and from the court and an incensed community, he met his just reward.

But how came Mr. E. by his knowledge of the "communication" to which he alludes? How came he by my *private and confidential letter* to bishop George? As he has not told us, I think can inform the reader; and if there be no "mystery of iniquity" in the transaction, there is, at least, something that looks very much like it.

In the summer of 1822, bishop George called at my house, with an intention of sending his son to my academy. He breakfasted with me; and in the course of the conversation, which turned upon the presiding elder question, I said, "what is it to me as a local preacher, whether the bishop appoints the presiding elder, or whether he is elected by the annual conference. I have nothing to do with the abstract question; and considering it as an abstract question, it is not worth a shankless button." In this opinion Mr. George concurred, expressing his "surprise that Mr. McKendree would throw the connexion into a flame for a thing, which, in the abstract, was not worth a straw."

In March 1823, the Baltimore district conference appointed Dr. S. K. Jennings, Rev. J. R. Williams and myself, "a committee of correspondence to make communications to other adjacent district conferences, inviting them to co-operate in a memorial to the next general conference." See *Wesleyan Repository*, vol. 3, p. 41. The committee performed their duty, and sent a copy of their "circular" to Mr. Bangs, editor of the *Methodist Magazine*, and to Mr. Stockton, editor of the *Wesleyan Repository*, for publication. Mr. Stockton published the "circular" but Mr. Bangs would not. When Mr. Bangs refused to give this document a place in the *Magazine*, I determined to become a subscriber to the *Wesleyan Repository*, and addressed a note to Mr. Stockton, on that subject. See *Wesleyan Repository*, vol. 3, page 120.

At a meeting of the reformers in Baltimore in May 1824, they resolved to institute a new work to be called the "Mutual Rights," and to place the same under the control of a committee of four local preachers, and four laymen. I was elected one of that committee. On the 25th of Feb. 1825, bishop George wrote me a letter, in which he censured me severely, for the part I had taken, as one of the editorial committee, in publishing that work. To this letter I sent an answer, and this answer is the "communication which reached episcopal ears." The reader will bear in mind, that to the period when I wrote this answer, I had not commenced writing my "History and Mystery;" nor had I any thought of doing it. All that Mr. E. has said about my being "*several years* in preparing that work," and of making the "communication which reached episcopal ears *during the very period* in which he was engaged in preparing his book," Def. p. 87, is absolutely false. On the 4th of April 1826, I was selected to deliver a lecture before the Union Society of Baltimore. I chose for my subject the gov-

ernment of the Methodist episcopal church. From various considerations I was induced to commit it to writing ; and I commenced writing it according to the views I had entertained, respecting the origin of the episcopacy, for 28 years. But when I began to examine the records of the church, and collate them closely and critically, I found I had been in an error all that time. I soon discovered, that the records of the church did not support my former opinions, and as I proceeded in the investigation I was more and more convinced that these records were not and could not be, the true and original ones. The lecture was prepared and read before the Union Society on the 6th of June following, as the subjoined certificate will prove.

“April 4th, 1826. A committee was selected for the purpose of selecting a lecturer, who chose Bro. M'Caine.”

“June 6th, 1826. According to appointment, a lecture was delivered by the Rev. Alexander M'Caine.” “This is to certify that the above are correct extracts from the Journal of the Baltimore Union Society. Oct. 24, 1828.

Levi R. Reese, Sec'y of the Balt. Union Society.”

I ask now where is my “inconsistency ?” where, my double dealing ? The “inconsistency” is in Mr. E's “own mind,” or in his own *heart*. Long after I had written my answer to bishop George's letter, I was convinced of the falsity of the records of the church, and made the “exposure” promptly. I know that this “exposure” is not the way to secure Methodist favor. It is not the way to obtain a taste of the “cup of sweets ;” nor is it the high road to the greatest benefice in the Methodist church. Had Mr. George lived, I should certainly say more of our correspondence, than I shall at present. One thing, however, in justice to myself must be told : that his correspondence was marked “in confidence” and “friendly and confidential.” Mine was “friendly and confidential” also. This “confidence” the Methodist bishop betrayed. And now Mr. E. boasts he has “a copy of a letter from one of the editorial committee in his pocket” which letter I believe to be the one I wrote to Mr. George !!! For the purpose of making me infamous, he has used it in the “Defence of our Fathers,” and plays it off against the “exposure,” made in my pamphlet, as a proof of my “inconsistency.” By this detestable conduct he has violated the sacredness of a “confidential” correspondence, which is considered, by every honourable man, to be an act no better than the breach of any other trust.

I shall now present the reader with bishop George's letter, and so much of my answer as relates to what Mr. E. has called my “inconsistency.” At some future day I hope to be able to find room for the entire correspondence in the “Mutual Rights and Christian Intelligencer.”

“February 25th, 1825.

“My dear brother—It will perhaps, be recollected by thee, and me, that during 30 years we have kept up a pleasant ac-

quaintance, that is to say, we have generally met with pleasure and parted in peace ; no changes of season or place has made any change in our minds, my opinion has always been that your Cardinal point has been the glory of God. Although some of our friends have thought you in some cases severely zealous for and against principles which you have espoused, or rejected, yet impartial investigation has proved to me that you were pursuing what in your opinion was the noble principles of *moral justice and good order*.

After these preliminary remarks I wish to call your attention to a subject which to me is of the first importance ; its probable you will bear with me though you may think me mistaken in my views, &c. &c. The subject is, the opinions introduced into the Mutual Rights, and set on float all over the continent as far as the committee has means and patronage. Finding your name among the editorial and circulating committee ; it is my decided opinion, that in all the numbers there are opinions which are clearly inadmissible ; but in the 6th No. there are things which to me are superlatively alarming, and its presumable yourself and the men associated with you holds yourselves responsible to all the Tribunals in Heaven and upon Earth for the truth and verity of all the things found in the numbers in general ; and the 6th No. in particular. Then permit me to ask you one or two questions : the first is what induced the Committee to Publish a weakly bill of charges against Itinnerant Missionaries for the board of themselves and Horses ? the question continued, did you ever hear of such a business in Europe or America among infidels or christians, that a man who asked an Itinnerant Missionary to his house that he might comfort him a few hours with the accommodations necessary to pursue his labours that in the Morning charged him for his lodgings. The only inference that I can draw from this unaccountable bill is that the Committee must have wandered out of every beaten track that has ever been heard of that they might roll a ponderous Mountain on the Itinnerant institutions and crush them, and then leap on the top of their towering Mountain, and shout aloud how high we are ? You know who it is that saith he, and of course they, who exalt themselves shall be abased : take care how you trifle with these institutions which has had Jehovah for their Guardian for more than half a Century ; and you or your Committee, and Satellites cannot clearly prove that the Glory has departed.—one more question why wander over the sea, take up what you consider an improper act of administration among our European brethren ? do you think them incompetent to correct their own errors, and direct their own institutions ? Or do you as a Committee set yourselves up as general reviewers with talent and Prerogatives to correct the errors of all churches ? This looks very much like a consequential flight upward. Permit me to say it looks a little like any port in a

storm, that is Let us conceal our March, but crush the Itinerant institutions. Perhaps you will say, these are hard questions, and their application grievous to be borne: I cannot in conscience say any thing more pleasant if any thing is said by me on this awful and terrific subject. My opinion is that Mr. Stockton and his Patrons, the Committee and their supporters have all comparatively speaking been burning and flaming under the influence of a fannattical and schismattical zeal, which has long since leaped the bounds of rational investigation. I look upon you as men who consider themselves injured in their rights, and when you come together you meet as men who have in their hands burning torches which you immediately put together and you instantly cry we are warm we are oppressed, and having no ballance of Power in your councils none to moderate your feelings you all with consent commence your operations with a stedfast determination to destroy tyranny and tyrants, and seem to forget that eleven twelfths of your brethren have any rights at all; for you will permit me to know the spirit of Baltimore, Norfolk, and the Roanoak District. And I know your plans in the General are held in sovereign contempt. And upon your plans you have no more probability of producing a reformation than you have to sweep down Jupiter and his Satellites with your feeble fingers—I conclude with pleading with my Bro. to quit this unimportant business and help us to get precious souls to Heaven.

I am yours as ever *in confidence*, ENOCH GEORGE."

Mr. George having charged me and the rest of the editorial committee, with a design to crush the itinerant institutions, I replied in the following extract, and it is to this part of my letter Mr E. refers, and this he adduces as proof of the "mystery of my inconsistency."

"How can a representation from the local ministry 'crush the itinerant institutions?' When, in the first place every man that is returned to the general conference, is supposed to love 'the itinerant institutions,' comparatively speaking, as he loves his life: and secondly, when there is a guarantee for the perpetuity of itinerancy in the attachment of his electors to its institutions. How is it possible that such a representation could destroy itinerancy? Would it interfere with the episcopal prerogative of appointing the presiding elders? Every body knows that this is a subject which cannot affect local preachers. I say again, what I once said to you at my own house, 'what is it to me, as a local preacher whether the bishop appoints the presiding elder, or whether he is elected by the annual conference. I have nothing to do with the abstract question, and considering it as an abstract question, it is not worth a shankless button.' In this opinion you concurred, expressing your surprise, that Mr. McKendree would throw the connexion into a flame for a thing, which, in the abstract, was

not worth a straw. This is a matter, however, that concerns the travelling preachers themselves, and if the shifting of this power into other hands, should ever cripple or "crush the itinerant institutions," it will be done by the travelling, and not by the local preachers. Indeed, if I may take the liberty of expressing all my mind upon this subject, the probability would be greater, for the continuance of the exercise of this prerogative from a local representation, than without it; for the affection and veneration for episcopal men, might, and no doubt would lead a local representation to support a measure, which they had no immediate and direct interest in opposing. Would representation from local preachers affect the prerogative of the episcopacy to appoint the travelling preachers to their respective stations and circuits? I think not. And I am at the greatest loss to conceive, how it can be thought to interfere with that part of our economy, or be made to bear upon that prerogative."

I will now submit to the candid reader to decide, whether there has been any inconsistency in my conduct. In the first place, when I wrote my letter to bishop George, I only adverted to a subject, upon which we had freely and fully conversed, when we were last together. I did not, therefore, consider it necessary to be more particular, or more guarded in my observations; especially when I had not the most distant thought, that bishop George would give my *private and confidential correspondence*, to a man, whom he *knew* to be my personal and avowed *enemy*, for the purpose of *injuring* my character. In the second place, when I commenced the examination of the origin of Methodist episcopacy, it was a year after the date of my letter to bishop George. This examination resulted in the development of facts and circumstances, which have been published in my "History and Mystery." Of these facts and circumstances I had no knowledge when I wrote to bishop George; consequently there can be no ground for the charge of "inconsistency," in making this "exposure," as contrasted with the declarations in my letter. In the third place, Mr. George did not consider that this communication was made for the purpose that Mr. E. intimates it was. For in the next letter he wrote me he expressed himself thus: "upon examination I think it my duty to say that I find in your letter, what I have always found in you, that is a disposition to be *honestly severe*." So that even Mr. George himself, convicts Mr. E. of writing that which is not true.



SECTION XIX.—Recapitulation and Conclusion.

I HAVE substituted the above title, for the one which stands in the "Defence of our Fathers," as being more appropriate to the contents of this section. I deem it of more importance

bring into a small compass, the principal facts which are noticed in my "History and Mystery" than to reply at length to the whining appeal which Mr. E. makes, to the passions of his readers. If Mr. Asbury's remains having been "deposited under the pulpit of Eutaw church," can impart any ministerial qualifications, or promote the spiritual improvement of the congregation who worship in that house, it is a most felicitous event for the preachers who ascend that pulpit, and for the congregation who assemble there. Or if it will undeniably and conclusively follow, because "his ashes rest there in peace as in a sacred and chosen asylum," that Methodist episcopacy is valid; that there are *three orders* of ministers in that church; and that Mr. Wesley recommended the episcopal form of government; then indeed, we have a new system of logic, and Mr. E. has obtained for himself, an imperishable fame, as being the author of it.

"The Union Society of Baltimore had not forgotten that the remains of bishop Asbury were disinterred and removed from Virginia." "They had not forgotten that these remains were deposited in this city." "They had not forgotten the solemnities with which they were placed under the pulpit in Eutaw church." All these things they knew; and all these things they remembered. They knew, also, that none of these things made for, or against, the statements in the History and Mystery of Methodist episcopacy. They knew, they neither confirmed their truth, nor proved their falsehood. They had, therefore, no reason to allude to these transactions; nor had they any inclination to disturb those remains. There is not a man of them who would enter the "sacred asylum of the dead," bring up those remains, and expose them to public view, to promote the cause of reform; any more, than they would imitate the *unnatural* conduct of Tullia, who drove over her father's dead body, which lay in her way to the senate house. If other men can enter the charnel-house for arguments to promote their cause, if they can convert the "remains" of the dead into steps, to reach their object, such sacrilegious conduct ought not to be attributed to any of the members of the Union society of Baltimore.

Having made these passing remarks upon the 19th section of the "Defence of our Fathers," I shall now recapitulate some of the principal facts, which are mentioned in my History and Mystery: the first of which regards the different views which ecclesiastical writers give us of episcopacy. I stated that Episcopalianism, in the strict sense of that term are divided into three classes. That, although they differ among themselves respecting the *origin* of the superiority of bishops; yet, they all agree in one particular, viz. that bishops are a distinct order from presbyters, and superior to them. This superiority I gave as the common acceptation of the term; and on this point there has been no *misrepresentation*. This is the first fact.

2nd Fact. The first section of the first chapter of the book

of discipline, which purports to be an account "of the *origin* of the Methodist episcopal church," was not written for upwards of *seven years* after the church was organized; and not until *after* the death of Mr. Wesley.

3d Fact. There is a discrepancy between the subject matter of the "foregoing account," and Mr. Wesley's letter, dated Sep. 10. 1784, inserted in the minutes of conference; which letter, it is said, "will afford as good an explanation as can be given of the subject;" viz. "for becoming a separate body under the denomination of the Methodist episcopal church." Any one who will take the trouble to compare these accounts, will find there is no misrepresentation here.

4th Fact. An account differing from both the foregoing (No. 2 and 3) is given in a chapter of the book of discipline printed in New-York in 1795. This chapter has long since, been expunged as contradicting the "account" given in ch. 1. sec. 1. of the present book of discipline. The reader will find this chapter on the 18th page of my History and Mystery. In it neither Mr. Wesley's preference for the episcopal form of government, nor his recommendation of that form, nor his letter of Sep. 10. 1784 has been glanced at. The adoption of the episcopal form is made to rest on *other grounds* than these; namely on the corrupt state of the church of England. All these things I recorded as facts in my book; and yet Mr. E. slept over them without the least notice or remark.

5th Fact. In the minutes of the conference, held when the church was organized, there are seventy six questions and their answers. Not one of these questions was printed in the volume of the American minutes, but other matter was substituted as may be seen by comparing these minutes with the prayer book of 1786.

6th Fact. The prayer book which Mr. Wesley abridged for the use of the American Methodists, and which was brought over "in sheets," was re-printed in London, at the press of Frys and Couchman, in a short time after Dr. Coke returned to England. He also had the minutes containing the above seventy-six questions and their answers re-printed at the same time and bound up with the prayer book.

7th Fact. Dr. Coke wrote a letter to Mr. Wesley urging him to ordain preachers for America; notwithstanding the measure had been opposed by Mr. Fletcher, Mr. Sellon, and some other clergymen at the conference. See Mr. Creighton's testimony on the 41st page of this book. Dr. Coke's letter was dated Aug. 9. 1784 and may be found in Moore's Life of Wesley, Vol. 2. p. 276. An extract from it may also be found in His. and Mys. p. 20. It ought to be noticed that Dr. Coke wrote the aforesaid letter after the conference had risen. Compare the above date with Wesley's Journals of Aug. 3. 1784.

8th Fact. When Dr. Coke came to America, his letter of ordination, as it has been called, was not published; although it has been considered "a part of the sketch" which Mr. Wesley.

drew up for the *use* of the societies. It is presumed the reason why this letter was not published, was because the preamble of it contradicted the organization of an "independent church." "Whereas many of the people in the southern provinces of North-America, *who desire to continue under my care*" &c.

9th Fact. Dr. Coke wrote to bishop White proposing to reunite the Methodist episcopal church with the Protestant episcopal church in the United States.

10th Fact. When Dr. Coke could not effect an union with the Protestant episcopal church in this country, he wrote to the bishop of London requesting him to ordain a given number of the British preachers. This he need not have done if he were a bishop.

11th Fact. Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury changed the title superintendent for bishop. "They changed the title themselves without the consent of the conference; and at the next conference they asked the preachers if the word *bishop* might stand in the minutes." Lee's His. of Methodism. p. 128.

12th Fact. Mr. Wesley wrote Mr. Asbury a letter of severe reproof for having assumed the title of bishop. In it he says "Men may call me a knave, or a fool, a rascal, a scoundrel, and I am content, but they shall never, by my consent, call me a bishop."

13th Fact. Although Mr. Wesley expressed himself so pointedly and so strongly against the title of bishop yet the very next year after he had written the letter containing the above extract, his name was placed at the head of their minutes as filling the *episcopal* office. Thus: "Who are the persons that exercise the episcopal office in the Methodist episcopal church in Europe and America? Answer. John Wesley, Thomas Coke, Francis Asbury." But Mr. E. says "Mr. Wesley was only entered as filling the episcopal office, but was not entitled bishop." If he was not a bishop, although thus entered, neither was Dr. Coke nor Mr. Asbury. For in ch. I. sec. I. of the book of discipline the term "episcopal" is mentioned six times, and the persons who "exercised" that "office," are called "bishops"

14th Fact. The travelling preachers who composed the conference in 1784, organized the Methodist societies into an "independent church," and assumed the title "the Methodist episcopal church." They did this without consulting the local preachers or lay members of the societies: They adopted the episcopal form contrary to the wishes of said societies, who were inclined to be Presbyterians: And they did it without the direction or recommendation of Mr. Wesley.

15th Fact. At the conference in 1784, the preachers made the following solemn declaration. "During the life of the Rev. Mr. Wesley, we acknowledge ourselves ready, in matters belonging to church government, to obey his commands."

16th Fact. Mr. Wesley wrote to Dr. Coke expressing a wish "that Mr. Richard Whatcoat may be appointed a superintendent with Mr. Francis Asbury." Mr. Wesley's wishes

were disregarded, notwithstanding the foregoing declaration; for Mr. Whatcoat was not appointed.

17th Fact. At the conference held in Baltimore in '87, Mr. Wesley's authority was disowned, and his name struck off the minutes of conference. Two things are to be noticed here, 1. The conference by which this cruel act was done, consisted of only a part of the whole itinerant connexion. Other conferences being held in other places that same year. 2. Mr. Asbury was present at that conference, and made no objection to it, but "was *mute* when it was" done.

18th Fact. At the very conference, at which Mr. Wesley's authority was disowned, and his name struck off the minutes, the title of "bishop" was entered on the minutes. See the 11th Fact.

19th Fact. When Mr. Wesley died, who was the "father" and founder of Methodism, and who had preached the gospel upwards of 60 years, there was no notice taken of his death in the minutes, although an obituary notice was recorded of a young man who died the same year, who "had been in the field of labour" only "*two years and a half.*"

20th Fact. When Mr. Asbury was enumerating the sources of his episcopal authority, the names of all who were concerned in the transaction, were mentioned except that of Mr. Wesley.

21st Fact. When Mr. Wesley wrote to Mr. Asbury, entreating him to put away the title of bishop, Mr. Asbury would not do it, although he was urged to do so by the following moving entreaties: "for my sake—for God's sake—for Christ's sake." The title of bishop he still retained.

22d Fact. Mr. Wesley's circular letter of Sep. 10, 1784, which, according to Mr. E's statement, was also part of the "sketch drawn up for the use of the societies," was *mutilated*, and only an extract from it, was published.

23d Fact. The minutes of conference were altered, and not one line of all that was recorded when the minutes were taken, which were printed by Charles Cist, in Philadelphia, and afterwards reprinted in London, is to be found in the book of printed minutes sold at the book room of the Methodist episcopal church.

24th Fact. Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury presented an "address to George Washington, president of the United States." Mr. Drew says, this address was presented before the doctor returned to Europe. That it was printed in the public papers, and found its way to England before the doctor. That charges were preferred against him in the conference, predicated upon this address. All this is admitted by Mr. E. but he says the address was not presented before the year 1789. Excepting the decrease of numbers this is the only fact in all my book of which there can be any doubt. If Mr. Drew's statement be an error, it remains so still, notwithstanding all Mr. E. has said. And if it be an error, it does not affect Methodist episcopacy: it neither confirms its claims, nor destroys its validity.

HAVING now presented in a condensed form, *some* of the facts contained in my "History and Mystery," I may be allowed to ask those who have been engaged in the "*pious work*" of slandering me, and who have raised the hue and cry of defamation against me, what "fact" have I "misrepresented," or what "circumstance" have I "misstated"? I have stated the foregoing facts in language that cannot be misunderstood; and I have stated them exactly as I found them in works which have chiefly been printed at the Methodist book room. These works are supposed to be in the hands of the members of the church. If, therefore, I have "misrepresented" any "fact" it is one of the easiest things in the world, to prove the misrepresentation. I defy my calumniators to do it. It will not be enough for those who make the charge to rest it upon their own unsupported declaration. Their assertion is one thing; the proof of the truth of that assertion is another. It is due to themselves, if they would avoid the charge of "slander and falsehood." It is due to Methodist episcopacy which they profess to defend. It is due to the sacred cause of TRUTH. It is due to one who has been most shamefully vilified and injured. Let them, then, prove what they have said, or if they cannot do it, let them recant their base and slanderous statements.

From stating "facts and circumstances" I shall proceed to offer some reasons which have induced me to believe that the form of government of the Methodist episcopal church has been surreptitiously introduced.

FIRST REASON. Because there is not a single line from Mr. Wesley's pen, in which he ever recommended the episcopal form of government to the American Methodists. Six of the preachers, who were in the conference of 1784, have informed me, that they never saw such a paper. If any one now living has seen such a paper, let him come forth and declare it. The want of such proof, is, of itself sufficient to establish the assertion, that the episcopal form of government has been surreptitiously introduced.

SECOND REASON. Because Mr. Wesley was induced to supply the American societies with the ordinances, from the assurances made him, that these societies "*desired to continue under his care.*" See the preamble to Dr. Coke's letter of appointment. But these assurances were soon violated.

THIRD REASON. Because in the circular of Sep. 10, 1784, Mr. Wesley says nothing about any particular form of government; although that letter is given in the minutes as the reason why the episcopal form was adopted. All he says is, "they are now at full liberty to follow the Scriptures and the primitive church." With this agrees Dr. Phœbus's statement, "Mr. Wesley recommended to us the New Testament for our pattern."

FOURTH REASON. In the circular of the above date, Mr. Wesley says, "In compliance with their desire, I have drawn up a little sketch." Where is that little sketch? Who ever saw it? Mr. E. now tells us that "Dr. Coke's letter of ordination"—"the *preface* to the prayer book"—"Mr. Wesley's letter of Sep. 10, 1784"—and "the prayer book, constituted together the little sketch." Def. p. 37. This does not agree with Mr. Wesley's language, "*I have drawn up a little sketch.*" This sketch could not consist of the above named papers, each of which was intended for a specific purpose.

FIFTH REASON. Because Mr. Wesley declared in the above circular that there are but *two orders*. He could not, therefore, have intended by setting Dr. Coke apart as a superintendent, to create a *third*.

SIXTH REASON. Because there is no evidence that Mr. Wesley approved of the proceedings of the conference in 1784 in becoming an "independent church," and assuming the title "the Methodist episcopal church."

SEVENTH REASON. Because Rev. Henry Moore, Mr. Wesley's biographer, declares, "Mr. Wesley never gave his sanction to any of these things."

EIGHTH REASON. Because Mr. Asbury's "attachment to the church of England" in which there are three orders "*was exceedingly strong.*" He also "preferred the episcopal, to the presbyterian form of government."

NINTH REASON. Because Mr. Asbury believed there are *three orders* of ministers.

TENTH REASON. Because in organizing the church, the episcopal form of government was adopted, contrary to the wishes of the societies. If the societies had been consulted, they would have adopted the presbyterian

form, not the episcopal. "Our numerous societies," says Dr. Coke, "would have been a regular presbyterian church were it not for me."

ELEVENTH REASON. Because Mr. Wesley's "*solemn injunctions*, not to take the title of bishop," were disregarded, and that title was afterwards taken.

TWELFTH REASON. Because Dr. Coke's letter of appointment, in which Mr. Wesley sets forth the "desire of the societies to continue under his care," was *suppressed*.

THIRTEENTH REASON. Because Mr. Wesley's circular letter of Sep. 10, 1784, was *mutilated* when published.

FOURTEENTH REASON. Because chapter 1, section 1, of the book of discipline, entitled "of the origin of the Methodist episcopal church" was not written until *after Mr. Wesley's death*.

FIFTEENTH REASON. Because it was never said until some time after Mr. Wesley's death, which event happened nearly 7 years after the organization of the church, that he *recommended* the episcopal form of government.

SIXTEENTH REASON. Because of the pains taken to exhibit episcopacy to the best advantage in ch. 1. sec. 1. of the book of discipline. The term "episcopal" occurring six times, the term "bishops" once, and Mr. Wesley's phrase "ordained ministers" being rejected, and "three regularly ordained clergy" substituted in its stead.

SEVENTEENTH REASON. Because the records of the church have been altered, see 119th page of this work.

EIGHTEENTH REASON. Because contradictory reasons are assigned for the adoption of the episcopal form of government: compare Mr. Wesley's letter of Sep. 10, 1784, the first chapter and first section of the book of discipline, and the account given in the book of discipline of 1795, copied into the *History and Mystery*, p. 18.

NINETEENTH REASON. Because Mr. Wesley's prayer book and the minutes of conference of 1784 were reprinted in England, at the press of Frys and Couchman, and not at Mr. Wesley's, in a short time after Dr. Coke returned to Europe; that, coming from England, with the minutes of the Methodist episcopal church bound up with it, it might seem as if these minutes had Mr. Wesley's approbation.

TWENTIETH REASON. Because Mr. Wesley's prayer book was laid aside, shortly after the church was organized. And now Mr. E. offers the recommendation of this prayer book as Mr. Wesley's recommendation of the episcopal form of church government!!!

TWENTY FIRST REASON. Because, in about two years after ordination had been obtained, Mr. Wesley's authority was disowned, and his name was struck off the minutes, by a "*few*" of the preachers, of *one* of the conferences held in that year.

TWENTY SECOND REASON. Because Mr. Brackenbury stated, that he saw a letter from Mr. Asbury in which he said, "that he would not receive any person deputed by Mr. Wesley to take any part of the superintendency of the work invested in him."

TWENTY THIRD REASON. Because Mr. Wesley declared he had himself "received some letters from Mr. Asbury affirming that no person in Europe knew how to direct those in America."

TWENTY FOURTH REASON. Because Mr. Asbury himself declares. "I did not think it practical expediency to *obey Mr. Wesley* in all matters relative to church government."

TWENTY FIFTH REASON. Because Mr. Asbury in a *confidential letter* to George Shadford said "Mr. Wesley and I are like Cæsar and Pompey—he will bear no equal and I will bear no superior."

TWENTY SIXTH REASON. Because the title *bishop* was assumed without the knowledge of the preachers. At the next conference permission was asked to let this title be entered on the minutes.

TWENTY SEVENTH REASON. Because the title *bishop* was placed on the minutes the same year that Mr. Wesley's authority was rejected.

TWENTY EIGHTH REASON. Because Mr. Wesley severely censured Mr. Asbury for assuming the title of bishop. "How can you, how dare you suffer yourself to be called a bishop? I shudder, I start at the very thought."

Men may call me a knave, or a fool, a rascal, a scoundrel, and I am content, but they shall never by my consent call me a bishop."

TWENTY NINTH REASON. Because Mr. Asbury would not put away the title of bishop, although he had been entreated to do so by Mr. Wesley in the following moving manner. "For my sake—for God's sake—for Christ's sake" &c. He would neither yield to reproof nor entreaty; but would rather forfeit the confidence and affection of Mr. Wesley his "father" his benefactor, and one of "his greatest friends," than part with the title of bishop.

THIRTIETH REASON. Because no notice is taken of Mr. Wesley's death in the American minutes of conference, although the death of one who had not travelled more than "two years and a half" is respectfully recorded.

THIRTY FIRST REASON. Because Mr. Asbury takes no notice of Mr. Wesley in enumerating the sources whence he derived his episcopal authority; and yet Mr. Wesley's recommendation of the "liturgy" is given as his recommendation of the episcopal form of government.

THIRTY SECOND REASON. Because of the strife between Dr. Coke, Mr. Asbury and the conference. See Dr. Coke's certificate of May 1787 in my His. and Mys. p. 62. Dr. Coke's letter dated Wilmington Del. May 1791 in my His. and Mys. p. 64. Dr. Coke's letter to bishop White in this work p. 58. See also an extract from his letter in "Defence of our Fathers" p. 91.

THIRTY THIRD REASON. Because Dr. Coke wrote a letter to bishop White, without consulting the conference, or even Mr. Asbury his colleague in the episcopal office; proposing to re-unite the Methodist with the Protestant episcopal church.

THIRTY FOURTH REASON. Because in the aforesaid letter, Dr. Coke acknowledged he "went further in the separation than Mr. Wesley, from whom he had received his commission, did intend."

THIRTY FIFTH REASON. Because Dr. Coke wrote to the bishop of London requesting him to ordain only a few of the British preachers. Would he have done this if he had been a bishop?

THIRTY SIXTH REASON. Because of the pains which have been taken by the rulers of the church, to effect concealment and prevent examination. Investigation being interdicted, in fact, under the penalty of excommunication.

THIRTY SEVENTH REASON. Because of the contradictory views of the writers who have undertaken to defend Methodist episcopacy. See Mr. Morrell's, Dr. Phœbus's, Mr. Bangs's, and Mr. Emory's pamphlets, Mr. Wesley's letter of Sep. 10 1784. The first chapter and first section of the book of discipline. The section extracted from the book of discipline of 1795 published in my His. and Mys. p. 18. The extract from Mr. Asbury's letter dated Dec. 26. 1806 in this work p. 90; and the Narrative and Defence, said to be written by T. E. Bond and signed by George Earnest and others. If the reader will compare these documents, he will find that the writers not only differ respecting the *origin* of "our episcopacy" and the *reasons* for adopting the episcopal form of church government: but that they contradict one another in their statements respecting the ministerial *order* to which a Methodist bishop belongs.

WHEN the candid reader shall have duly considered the nature, the number, and the variety of the facts set forth in the foregoing recapitulation, he will be led to the inevitable conclusion, that Methodist episcopacy, as it now exists, is not of Mr. Wesley's creating; nor could he have recommended the episcopal form of government to the American societies. He will be convinced that although these "facts" are so diversified in their character, originating under various circumstances, happening at different periods, and having been transacted by different agents, yet they all unite to prove such a recommendation impossible. And he will be convinced, by these "facts and reasons," that I am fully sustained in the assertion I have made that the episcopal form of government was *SURREPTITIOUSLY INTRODUCED*, and was imposed on the societies under the sanction of Mr. Wesley's name.

Erratum.—Expunge the words "for it" in the note on the 56th page, second line from the bottom.

FINIS.

DATE DUE

JUL 15 1971		
JAN 31 1971		
FEB 29 '81		
GAYLORD		PRINTED IN U.S.A.







